The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXIX, No. 1 JULY, 1948

CONTENTS

Recent Developments in Convert Work
John A. O'Brien 1

Catholic Population Trends in America
Clement S. Mihanovich 12

The Hospital Chaplain and the Administration of the Holy Eucharist . . . *Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.* 19

A Century of Service . . *Brother Alban of Mary* 28

The Ordeal of Father Wall. Part VI
Thomas Owen Martin 38

"Mediator Dei" and the Layman at Mass
Clarence McAuliffe, S.J. 49

New Concepts in Theology . *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 56

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

A "Planned Parenthood" Problem 63

G.K.C. and the True Religion 64

Contents Continued on Next Page

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price, currency: United States and Canada, $4.50; Foreign, $5.00. 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1948, by The Catholic University of America Press

Contents Continued from Previous Page

Deception in the Cause of Charity 64

A Problem in Sterilization 65

The Tabernacle Veil as the Sign of Reservation . . . 66

The Candlesticks should be *on* the Altar 67

Primary and Secondary Feasts 68

Longevity of the "Easter Water" 68

The Saint Felicitas of the *Nobis quoque* 69

ANALECTA 70

BOOK REVIEWS

Tractatus Dogmaticus de Eucharistia. Tome I: De Sacramento, *by Emmanuel Doronzo, O.M.I.* . . . 75

Canonical Procedure in Matrimonial Cases. Vol. I: Formal Judicial Procedure, *by Rev. William J. Doheny, C.S.C.* 76

AN OLD CHINESE PROVERB runs: "Fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me."

Unless one is an expert in judging yarns, dyeing methods and weaving, it is easy to be fooled in selecting fabrics for Sacred Vestments and Altar Draperies. It's something like buying precious stones. Only an expert can distinguish between "Perfect" and "Slightly Imperfect". The character and the reputation of the source are your most dependable guideposts. When your CHURCH GOODS DEALER shows you "Allen" Liturgical Fabrics, you see the finest quality produced anywhere in the world. There is no such thing as "just as good".

"Buy American"

ALLEN SILK MILLS

ALLEN MADE MEANS AMERICAN MADE

ALLEN SILK MILLS

Manufacturers

Charles M. Muench, *Executive Director*

140 West 31st Street **New York 1, N. Y.**

VESTMENT FABRICS BANDINGS

DRAPERY FABRICS EMBLEMS

Sold exclusively through Church Goods Dealers

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN CONVERT WORK

We have recently completed a survey of the convert work being done in the United States. It embraced the work of priests and lay people. With the assistance of chancery offices, bishops, and priests throughout the nation we gathered data concerning the methods of recruiting prospects and new techniques in the instruction of the same.

The results show a marked improvement over our findings of twenty years ago. At that time all parishes receiving more than fifty converts per year could virtually be counted on the fingers of two hands. Now there are many parishes with an annual total ranging between fifty and one hundred and some that are regularly passing the two hundred mark.

We have recently brought out a symposium, *Winning Converts*, in which a representative group of outstanding convert makers detail their methods and experiences. We hope that the volume, mirroring the trends, developments, and new techniques worked out since the publication of *The White Harvest* twenty years ago, will give added momentum to the convert movement in America.

We are privileged to present here a few of the outstanding findings contained in the above-named symposium. They will be of interest and of practical helpfulness, we hope, not only to priests and religious but to zealous lay men and women as well.

GROUP INSTRUCTION PLAN

Perhaps the most significant fact brought out in the whole study is the remarkable fruitfulness resulting from the use of the group instruction plan. Virtually every parish reporting an unusually high total of converts is using that method. In parishes where the instructions had been given individually, it was found that the adoption of the class plan doubled or tripled the average annual total previously received. Priests who had been sceptical about the plan became enthusiastic after using it and perceiving the economy of effort and the vastly greater results achieved.

Moreover, the people being instructed usually prefer the class method, where they can relax and be more at ease than when the individual is the sole target of the priest's oratorical efforts. Furthermore they profit by the questions occasionally asked by

others and frequently derive added courage to take the step which they see many others likewise preparing to take.

The class method should always be supplemented, of course, by abundant individual contact and instruction. By coming to the room a half-hour or so before the instruction begins, the priest . . . better still if several are available . . . will be able to meet each individual and to have a little chat with each one and thus find out how the individual is progressing and ascertain whether or not he needs some individual attention. By remaining for a little while after the class the priest will be able to have additional private conferences with similar good results. In addition there should be definite appointments for conferences with each individual to make sure that the person has no obstacles to his entrance into the Church and to give him some advice, instruction, and encouragement suited to his needs. The discerning priest will be quick to size up the amount of time and help to be given to each individual after the first or second talk with the person.

So impressive have been the results from the group instruction plan that some bishops have already requested all their pastors to institute the inquiry class and to conduct the same two or three times a year. The class of instruction is usually held twice a week for about three months. Particularly during the last month all the members are given individual conferences and are provided all the help and encouragement to make an affirmative decision in the matter. There is every reason to believe that the adoption of the group instruction plan, supplemented with individual instructions, in every parish in America will lift the annual total of converts from the hundred thousand mark high into the million mark.

ENLIST LAITY

The study brings out clearly that the enlistment of our laity in convert work is urgently needed if we are to win constantly increasing numbers of converts. The very fact that there are in the neighborhood of one hundred million non-Catholic people in our land should be sufficient evidence that the winning of the bulk of these people for Christ will demand the efforts of more than forty thousand priests. That achievement will require the joint efforts of all the priests and all our Catholic laity. The strange and disturbing fact to all students of the convert move-

ment is the failure to educate the laity concerning their duty of assisting in the work of winning souls.

"Why, the idea of trying to win a convert," a lay friend said to us recently, "never even occurred to me. Like practically all other Catholic acquaintances of mine, I have always assumed that the proper thing to do was to avoid discussion of religion with non-Catholics. Hence, in all my life I have never tried to bring a non-Catholic to Mass with me or to loan him a Catholic book, or to suggest that he come with me to a priest to receive a good course of instruction in the Catholic religion."

In that utterance there was mirrored, we think, the attitude of probably ninety-nine per cent of the Catholic lay men and women of our land.

Is it not evident that we must launch a vigorous and determined crusade on a national scale to dissipate such apathy and to make clear to all our laity the divinely appointed duty of striving to win souls for Christ? Obviously sermons must be preached frequently on this subject. Articles, pamphlets, and books must be written on this general theme and widely circulated among our people.

We must point out to our people the spectacular growth of the Witnesses of Jehovah . . . a growth of more than a thousand per cent in six years . . . due to the crusading missionary zeal of all their members. How deeply stirred our Catholic laity will be when they learn that if we registered the same proportionate gains as the Witnesses of Jehovah, the people of America would be won for Christ and for the Church founded directly and immediately by Him. That tremendous achievement would have been effected in less than the six years taken by the Witnesses to achieve their growth. If each Catholic were to win but one convert a year, America would be won for Christ in two and a half years!

The Witnesses call at every home not only in America but also in England. Imagine our surprise when, as a research scholar at Oxford living with the Jesuit Fathers at Campion Hall, we found the Witnesses ringing our doorbell in the hope of converting us to their bizarre and grotesque cult. That is like asking an intelligent person to commit intellectual suicide.

The Convert Makers of America is a pioneer organization of Catholic lay men and women formed to win converts. It provides detailed counsel and guidance to each of its members in their appointed task of explaining their Holy Faith to their non-

Catholic friends and acquaintances and in striving by every prudent and tactful means to win them for Christ. We hope that every lay person, especially our young men and women, will join that organization and give to it their best efforts.

COURSES IN SEMINARIES

Our seminaries hold the key to the solution of the convert problem in America. In their hallowed halls our future priests are trained. It is evident that the training in the technique of recruiting prospects and of instructing them must be given in the seminary. In addition there must be imparted to them that quenchless thirst for souls which will drive them in all their priestly years to search in season and out of season for the sheep that are lost, strayed, or stolen.

If convert work is presented as an integral part of the priestly ministry, they will not wait after their ordination for prospects to ring the rectory doorbell. They will go out after them. They will spend two or three hours each day in looking for prospects and in arranging for their instruction. Recall the observation of the Chicago pastor who won 1,300 converts in twenty-one years that a minimum of two hours a day should be spent by every priest in convert work.

At Kenrick Seminary, as at other major seminaries, definite instruction in convert work was given to the seminarians, particularly to the members of the Brownson Club organized for this purpose. The results which those members have achieved since their ordination have been striking indeed. Flinging themselves with all their youthful energy and determination into the apostolate for the strayed sheep they have succeeded in winning thousands back into the fold. They have given a stirring demonstration of what our seminarians can achieve on a nationwide scale when definite training in convert work is given for at least the four years preceding ordination.

The long summer vacation offers an excellent opportunity for the seminarians to put into practice the training they are receiving in the seminary. They can assist their respective pastors by looking up prospects and fallen-aways and by selling the young men on the idea of joining the Convert Makers of America and becoming faithful and zealous workers in that organization. By making a house-to-house canvass, the seminarian will acquire a

world of experience in the important art of "selling" the religion of Christ to the non-Catholic people who fill most of the homes in every city block. In this way seminarians will supplement their theoretical training in the seminary with field work in the parish, so that they will be experienced in all the techniques of convert work, including that of class instruction, by the time of their ordination.

If every seminary in our country would stress convert making, and, like the Paulist Seminary at Washington, institute a four-year course in it and give its students the opportunity for the field work already mentioned, we would have an army of forty thousand expert leaders to direct the labors of our twenty-five million laity along efficient and fruitful lines. There is no doubt that in this way our seminaries would play the role of quarter-back in calling the signals that would lead to the gathering of the great white harvest in America for the Divine Master.

RECLAIMING FALLEN-AWAYS

In our zeal in searching for converts, we must not forget our fallen-aways and those who are in the process of lapsing. Recent studies disclose that the number of fallen-aways is far greater than most of us have imagined. Let us offer an illustration. In a community where we had just completed a public course of lectures for non-Catholics and had secured the assurance of twenty-five members of the class that they were going to embrace the Faith, we got the jolt of our life. At just about that time a house-to-house canvass of the entire city had been completed by the Victory-Noll catechists.

The cards of people living within the limits of that particular parish and claiming to be Catholics were turned over to the pastor. Imagine his surprise when in going through the cards he discovered not less than 885 souls registering as Catholics, of whom he had no trace in the parish register. The total souls listed in that parish amounted to 2,325. This meant that a number equal to one-third of his listed parishioners were lax in the practice of the Faith, maintained no definite practical affiliation, offered no regular financial support or were entirely out of the Church.

The incident we have cited has occurred in substantially the same form in hundreds of communities where a careful house-to-

house canvass has been made. "For years," remarked a pastor recently, "I have prided myself upon knowing my people. I have made it a practice to take a daily walk in the parish. I have instructed my parishioners to notify me when a new family moves into the parish so I can affiliate such a family at once.

"A short time ago the ministerial association and the Y.M.C.A. sponsored a house-to-house canvass. When the cards of people who registered as Catholics, and as residing within my parish limits were turned over to me, I got the shock of my life. Hundreds of people of whom I had never even heard, had registered as baptized Catholics. I'm convinced now that this is typical of what would be found in most of our city parishes."

Many similar investigations compell us to concur with the conclusion of that zealous shepherd of souls. The winning of America for Christ involves two important plans of campaign. One is to win those who have not been born in the Faith; the other is to hold all those who have inherited at birth the precious patrimony of the true Faith. Priests and people must launch a vigorous and well-organized campaign to discover any Catholics who are lapsing or who have already fallen away and reclaim them to the active and fervent practice of the Faith of Christ. In that important campaign our seminarians can play a key role by conducting the house-to-house canvass during their summer vacation and helping the pastor in instructing and in reclaiming these members of the household of the Faith who stand in urgent need of remedial treatment.

OPEN FORUM

Some forty years ago we visited the Cathedral in Denver, where Father Hugh L. McMenamin was conducting each Sunday evening an Open Forum. He used it as a feeder for his convert classes and enabled himself and his priestly associates to achieve an average of about sixty-four converts year after year. This device has proven effective along these lines in many places. In visiting the Farm Street Church in London, we found that a variation of it in the form of a pulpit dialogue was being employed with success. A priest in one pulpit proposed questions and difficulties which were answered by a priest in another pulpit. We followed this plan on Sunday evenings during Lent at St.

John's Church at the University of Illinois with profitable results.

Recently we visited Grand Rapids, where we found the pulpit dialogues conducted by the two Paulist Fathers in charge of the newly established Catholic Information Center attracting large crowds of people, both Catholic and non-Catholic. Since the crucial problem in winning converts is that of recruiting prospects, we think that the open forum or the pulpit dialogues will prove of increasing usefulness along these lines.

USE OF RADIO

Because it reaches so many people, the radio has become an important instrument for the dissemination of Catholic truth. A number of splendid Catholic programs are now being broadcast. The more the better. In some of the programs we are considerably limited in the presentation of distinctive doctrines and practices of the Catholic Religion. It is to be hoped that we will find increasing opportunity to present in a friendly, expositional manner the principal doctrines and practices of our Faith. Msgr. J. A. Gabriels informs us that he uses his broadcast each Sunday to interest hearers in the classes of instruction which he and his assistants are constantly conducting at the Church of the Resurrection in Lansing, Michigan.

His experience indicates how helpful it would be if pastors could arrange to speak over local radio stations each week and thus interest many more non-Catholics in the investigation of the religion of Jesus Christ. We feel that we have just scratched the surface as far as the use of the radio is concerned for the winning of souls for Christ. It will richly repay us to study carefully how we can make greater use of this marvel of the air for the advancement of the truths of Christ.

NEWSPAPER PUBLICITY

The contributors to this work have pointed out the rich returns they have derived from the use of newspaper publicity. In some instances, the story can be gotten across in the form of a news item. In other cases, a paid advertisement is inserted. Because the newspaper goes into thousands of homes in which no Catholic priest would ordinarily enter, it is worthwhile to have our

invitation to classes of instruction printed in the daily newspaper. Every priest who has thus used the newspaper will testify to the appearance at his class of instruction of people of whose existence he was previously completely unaware.

The Religious Information Bureau, under the direction of Fr. Lester J. Fallon, C.M., and under the sponsorship of the Knights of Columbus of Missouri, is doing an outstanding job in bringing to the people of that state a knowledge of many of the teachings and practices of the Catholic Faith through carefully prepared advertisements. Many persons whose interest is thus aroused are provided with pamphlets and, if the interest warrants it, are offered the complete course of instruction by mail provided by the Confraternity Home Study Service. Fr. Fallon informs us that a considerable number of converts, instructed through his correspondence course, owe their initial interest to these carefully worded advertisements.

If the Knights of Columbus and other Catholic organizations in other states could be enlisted to sponsor similar campaigns of paid advertisements, we would go a long way toward removing the veil now hiding so much of the Catholic Faith from the minds of our fellow countrymen. Think of reaching the hundred millions of our non-Catholic compatriots through weekly advertisements, giving to them important insights into many of the doctrines and practices of the Catholic Faith which are so often misunderstood! It seems evident that if we are in earnest in our efforts to win not the present mere one hundred thousand converts a year but millions of converts annually, we must present the invitation on a much larger scale than hitherto. We must pound away year in and year out in the effort to infiltrate into the deepest marrow of the hundred million non-Catholic people of our land.

DISTRIBUTION OF PAMPHLETS

Because of its small and compact character, the pamphlet fits into the hurried, staccato tempo of our day. It is an admirable medium of getting across a knowledge of the basic teachings of our Holy Faith to the non-Catholic population. The Witnesses of Jehovah are doing an outstanding job in the distribution of such literature. Their phenomenal growth testifies eloquently to the efficacy of such efforts. We make an earnest plea for the instal-

lation of pamphlet racks displaying fifty to one hundred titles in the vestibule of every Catholic church in our land.

We urge likewise our Catholic laity to form the habit of taking home with them each Sunday a pamphlet, reading it carefully themselves and then loaning it to a dozen or more non-Catholic friends. In this way we shall blanket America with pamphlets and shall use them as a means of recruiting millions of prospects for courses of systematic instruction in the Catholic Faith. We have but scratched the surface of the usefulness of the pamphlet for convert work, and we recommend the use of this pocket-sized literature to every Catholic man and woman as a helpful means of enabling them to win each year several converts for Christ.

INFORMATION

The Paulist Fathers have established a monthly magazine, *Information*, designed particularly for convert work. It features the conversion of many leading converts and shows the line of reasoning which has appealed to each. We recommend that every Catholic family subscribe to this magazine so that they may receive abundant help and guidance in the fulfillment of their divinely appointed task of winning converts for Christ. A year's subscription, costing only $2 in the United States and $2.50 in Canada, should be sent to *Information*, 411 W. 59th Street, New York 19, N. Y.

PAULIST LEAGUE

The Paulist League has been formed by the Paulist Fathers for the specific purpose of winning America for Christ. Its members receive a monthly release, *The Paulist News*, which keeps them informed of developments in the convert field. The members are asked to co-operate with the Paulist Fathers by works of personal zeal, by prayer and by the support of missionary enterprises. Holy Mass is offered daily for the welfare of all members. They share in all the Masses, prayers, and good works of all the Paulist Fathers and in the prayers and Communions of all Paulist candidates for the priesthood. Additional spiritual privileges are granted by the Holy See. Membership is as follows: Individual—$1; Associate—$2; Family—$5; Life—$100. We encourage all our readers to join the Paulist League and thus supply re-

enforcements to the zealous and tireless workers who are spearheading the Church's drive for the winning of America for Christ.

CONVERSIONS AMONG NEGROES

The national survey we conducted brings out clearly the unusually fruitful field that is to be found for convert work among our Negro brethren. The largest number of converts are being won today in those parishes which are ministering to our colored countrymen. They stand in special need of the help, comfort, and strength provided by the religion of Jesus Christ. They respond with appreciation to the priests and people who strive to bring to them the knowledge of Christ's saving truths. By redoubling our efforts to win these souls for Christ, we shall render a great service not only to the Church but to our beloved country.

The Communists are working overtime in their feverish efforts to indoctrinate these good and simple people with the teachings of Marx and Engels. We have at the present a very small percentage of the Negroes of the United States in the Catholic fold. The work of the pastors in colored parishes, who are winning two hundred and more converts annually, shows us clearly that we all must roll up our sleeves and pitch in whole-heartedly in the divinely appointed task of bringing the full Gospel of Christ to enrich, emancipate, and beautify the lives of our colored brethren.

INSTRUCTION BY MAIL

The study shows that there are thousands of people who are hesitant about ringing a rectory doorbell and asking for a course of instruction. We can meet the need of that vast multitude by making known to them the availability of instruction by mail. Not only in country districts where no Catholic church exists, but also in large cities there are many people who would prefer to receive the first information about the Catholic Faith through the mail. Hence, we suggest that priests and people make more widely known the availability of such correspondence courses free of charge. Doubtless if we could get across this information to millions of non-Catholics, the Confraternity Home Study Service would be ministering to a far greater clientele than it is now reaching.

While sooner or later a priest must come personally into the

picture, evidence clearly indicates that in the initial stages the mailman is a more acceptable caller at the door. We hope that this splendid service will grow by leaps and bounds and that, as the misunderstandings and prejudices of our non-Catholic neighbors are dissipated, they will welcome as among their dearest and best friends the priest of Jesus Christ. He will establish the Enthronement of the Sacred Heart in their homes and bring to them in constantly increasing measure the blessings of Almighty God.

A HOLY CRUSADE

The winning of the hundred million non-Catholic people in America for Christ will demand the mobilization of every Catholic man, woman, and child in a mighty crusade for the carrying of the Faith into every nook and corner of our land. If the symposium brings out any one truth clearly, it is that the conversion of America will demand more than the efforts of forty thousand priests. We must make our lay people convert-minded. We must preach to them in season and out of season the duty of winning souls for Christ. We must fill them with a flaming zeal for the propagation of the Faith of Christ. We must fill them with a divine discontent until each individual has formed the habit of winning several souls for Christ annually. What the Witnesses of Jehovah have done, we too can do—and more.

Peter the Hermit went through the countries of Europe preaching the need of a crusade to rescue the Holy Land from the hands of the Mohammedans. His cry was, "God wills it!" We too must sound that crusading cry in every parish and mission of our land. We must echo and re-echo the words of Christ addressed to all His disciples: "Going therefore teach ye all nations . . . teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." We can be sure of the assistance promised by the Divine Master when He said: "And behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world." With that divine assistance we cannot fail. St. John sounds the keynote of our ultimate success in those prophetic words: "This is the victory which overcometh the world—our faith."

JOHN A. O'BRIEN

The University of Notre Dame
South Bend, Ind.

CATHOLIC POPULATION TRENDS IN AMERICA

Very little is known concerning the characteristics and trends of the Catholic population in the United States. A few isolated studies have been made but these were limited in scope and area. At present we can only estimate the birth and death rate trends among U. S. Catholics. This paucity of information is not only significant but also alarming. Without this information the planning of churches, parishes, missionary work, etc., becomes a process of stumbling and fumbling—groping in the darkness.

It is high time that the Catholic Church in the U. S. turned its attention to evaluating, calculating, and weighing its resources—the Catholic population. Many interesting and valuable revelations will be brought forth by a demographic study of American Catholics. We speak of the high birth rate among Catholics. Precisely how high or low is it? We are concerned over the high rates of mixed marriages. Do you know what per cent of Catholic marriages are mixed marriages? Many more and equally important questions could be asked. The only present reply we have to these questions is guess work, estimates, small pieces of data, and, in most cases, wishful thinking.

In order to get some idea of the characteristics of certain aspects of the composition of the U. S. Catholic population, the writer made a study of *The Official Catholic Directory,* 1947 edition.

Let us face the facts from the start. The information contained in this *Directory,* covering the year 1946, is not necessarily completely accurate. Neither is it necessarily complete. The unreliability of Catholic population figures contained in Catholic periodicals is taken for granted. However, in spite of this probable deficiency, it is possible, on the basis of the figures contained in the *Directory,* to secure some indication of a trend. The trend revealed by the statistics in the *Directory* will be as accurate as the statistics on which it is based.

Specifically, the writer was interested in computing and deriving the birth rate, death rate, the per cent of mixed marriages and the per cent of the population Catholic in each diocese and archdiocese from the figures printed in the *Directory.*

The per cent of the population Catholic in the dioceses and archdioceses was computed on the basis of the reported number of

Catholics in each and the 1940 census figures for the total population in the confines of each diocese and archdiocese. The birth rate was reckoned on the basis of the number of baptisms (not converts) per thousand Catholic population. The death rate was secured on the basis of the number of funerals and burials per thousand Catholic population. The basis for securing the per cent of mixed marriages is, of course, obvious.

Partial results, in summary fashion, of this study are embodied in the following table:

DEATH RATES, BIRTH RATES, PER CENT OF MIXED MARRIAGES OF THE U. S. CATHOLIC POPULATION FOR 1946, ACCORDING TO GEOGRAPHICAL REGIONS AND DIVISIONS

Area	% of pop. Catholic	Live births per 1000 pop.	Deaths per 1000 pop.	% of marriages mixed
NORTH REGION				
New England States	39.6	27.4	11.0	28.0
Middle Atlantic	28.0	28.2	11.5	25.2
East North Central	15.1	27.5	11.1	36.6
West North Central	15.3	29.8	10.1	34.1
Total Average	29.0	28.1	10.9	31.0
SOUTH REGION				
South Atlantic States	4.4	40.6	10.3	62.5
East South Central	4.7	32.3	11.6	53.5
West South Central	28.1	38.5	8.6	33.2
Total Average	9.3	37.1	10.2	49.7
WEST REGION				
Mountain States	20.4	35.7	10.8	36.9
Pacific States	15.7	32.2	10.1	42.3
Total Average	18.3	34.0	10.5	40.0
Av. for all regions	18.8	33.1	10.8	40.2

Note: The national birth rate in 1946 was 23.3 and the national death rate 10.1. The minor mathematical discrepancies found in the above table were necessitated by the incompleteness of the original sources of the data.

A careful perusal of the above table will reveal a number of interesting facts.

(1) On the basis of the 1940 census, the Catholics constituted 18.8 per cent of the total U. S. population. (However, on the basis

of the 1946 estimate of the U. S. population, the Catholics had only 17.6 per cent of the total population.)

(2) The Catholic birth rate of 33.1 babies per thousand population was higher, comparatively speaking, than the birth rate of 23.3 per thousand for the whole of the U. S.

(3) The Catholic death rate for 1946 was 10.8. This figure is .7 higher than the national death rate of 10.1 for 1946.

(4) Over 40 per cent of all Catholic marriages were mixed marriages.

The following table presents the same statistical study, given according to archdioceses and dioceses. It should be remarked, however, that any comparison between the various units would be unjust unless the particular circumstances of each were known and understood.

DEATH RATES, BIRTH RATES, PER CENT OF MIXED MARRIAGES OF U. S. CATHOLIC POPULATION FOR 1946, ACCORDING TO ARCHDIOCESES AND DIOCESES

Area	% of pop. Catholic	Live births per 1000 pop.	Deaths per 1000 pop.	% of marriages mixed
ARCHDIOCESES:				
Baltimore	18.8	32	19	49.4
Boston	41.2	28	11	unknown
Chicago	38.3	23	9	20.5
Cincinnati	16.9*	34	13	34.7
Denver	11.2	52	14	37.2
Detroit	26.6*	25	7	20.4
Dubuque	17.4	29	11	30.7
Indianapolis	8.6	34	13	47.4
Los Angeles	17.0	30	8	37.2
Louisville	13.9	33	11	47.4
Milwaukee	29.7	33	11	26.6
Newark	37.9	27	9	18.4
New Orleans	40.5	34	9	30.6
New York	25.9	27	10	22.1
Omaha	22.7	25	7	24.0
Philadelphia	26.8	32	12	23.0
Portland (Ore.)	9.9	30	11	48.6
St. Louis	25.5*	22	8	29.2
St. Paul	22.2	35	10	35.5

San Antonio	30.1	48	11	15.3
San Francisco	22.1	28	10	36.5
Santa Fé	50.4	41	9	8.6
DIOCESES:				
Albany	29.8	33	20	40.7
Alexandria	6.4	40	9	47.5
Altoona	20.1	26	9	14.8
Amarillo	4.6	43	8	34.0
Baker City	5.5	45	16	56.1
Belleville	10.3	25	13	32.9
Bismarck	20.9	39	9	22.8
Boise	4.2	35	12	52.4
Brooklyn	24.2	33	11	15.5
Buffalo	48.9	21	7	28.0
Burlington	27.0	30	11	33.8
Camden	19.3	29	10	26.9
Charleston	.8	46	11	72.5
Cheyenne	14.8	25	7	44.9
Cleveland	24.6	29	10	20.6
Columbus	8.9	28	11	52.1
Corpus Christi	71.4	66	7	8.9
Covington	4.8	22	14	39.8
Crookston	13.0	36	10	34.0
Dallas	2.9	39	9	51.2
Davenport	10.8	28	16	40.4
Des Moines	7.4	28	12	39.2
Duluth	22.9	23	9	47.3
El Paso	71.9	45	8	11.6
Erie	19.0	30	12	34.5
Evansville	13.0	30	10	30.6
Fall River	47.7	26	12	unknown
Fargo	17.0	36	10	24.3
Fort Wayne	16.5	30	10	28.9
Gallup	27.5	44	10	21.2
Galveston	12.9	30	6	37.9
Grand Island	9.5	38	11	32.6
Grand Rapids	8.1	36	13	33.9
Great Falls	16.7	29	10	46.3
Green Bay	37.9	29	9	22.0
Harrisburg	8.9	29	12	42.1
Hartford	39.0	26	11	40.4
Helena	26.3	24	12	40.2

Honolulu	27.8	23	5	unknown
Kansas City	6.6	30	12	40.1
La Crosse	23.4	34	11	20.9
Lafayette (Ind.)	4.6	24	9	68.2
Lafayette (La.)	63.9	29	7	16.6
Lansing	7.7*	42	10	29.2
Leavenworth	13.5	24	10	37.7
Lincoln	8.6	35	10	31.2
Little Rock	1.8	25	7	57.2
Madison	18.6	37	13	31.2
Manchester	35.8	23	11	38.5
Marquette	31.9	30	13	35.3
Mobile	2.1	27	9	61.3
Monterey-Fresno	24.1	29	8	26.2
Nashville	1.1	47	14	62.8
Natchez	2.0	31	10	60.4
Ogdensburg	34.2	34	15	30.2
Oklahoma-Tulsa	3.0	26	13	54.1
Owensboro	4.5	34	12	50.0
Paterson	29.0	29	11	21.1
Peoria	12.2	26	13	39.2
Pittsburgh	34.1	26	11	23.1
Portland (Me.)	24.5	28	11	16.9
Providence	54.6	27	10	14.3
Pueblo	23.3	40	11	19.6
Raleigh	.4	62	9	73.8
Rapid City	28.6	25	5	47.7
Reno	19.3	24	14	43.0
Richmond	3.1	37	9	65.2
Rochester	25.2	27	14	38.7
Rockford	18.3	30	12	36.8
Sacramento	17.2	24	8	45.9
Saginaw	25.0	34	10	23.6
St. Augustine	4.7	43	12	53.1
St. Cloud	26.4	30	10	24.0
St. Joseph	4.5	29	12	50.7
Salina	11.9	32	10	24.4
Salt Lake	3.2	41	9	56.0
San Diego	24.2*	36	7	35.0
Savannah-Atlanta	.9	41	11	71.2
Scranton	33.4	22	12	18.2
Seattle	10.9	32	11	48.5
Sioux City	13.4	30	10	27.8

Sioux Falls	12.4	32	10	33.4
Spokane	10.4	36	12	46.7
Springfield (Ill.)	10.9	19	10	40.6
Springfield (Mass.)	47.0	31	11	24.3
Steubenville	12.1	17	8	43.6
Superior	19.3	31	13	30.6
Syracuse	30.6	27	12	30.4
Toledo	18.3	31	11	30.5
Trenton	29.8	29	9	23.7
Tucson	27.8	38	11	unknown
Wheeling	3.3	28	11	41.7
Wichita	6.8	38	9	36.0
Wilmington	7.6	39	unknown	46.8
Winona	15.7	31	11	29.5
Youngstown	19.0	29	10	28.2
GREEK CATHOLIC DIOCESES:				
Pittsburgh	unknown	39	14	5.8
Ukrainian	unknown	7	10	20.1
Belmont Abbey	7.0	38	8	88.9

*Approximations

This table acquaints us with a number of pertinent facts.

(1) Ninety per cent of the archdioceses (with an average of over 32 births per thousand population) and 92 per cent of the dioceses (with an average of over 33) had a birth rate higher than the national average.

(2) The highest birth rates were found in the dioceses of Corpus Christi (66 births per thousand Catholic population), and Raleigh (62).

(3) The lowest birth rates were found in the archdioceses of Chicago (23), St. Louis (22); and in the dioceses of Buffalo (21), Covington (22), Duluth (23), Manchester (23), Scranton (22), Springfield, Ill. (19), and, Steubenville (17).

(4) Fifty per cent of the archdioceses (with an average of 11.8 deaths per thousand Catholic population) and 50.5 per cent of the dioceses (with an average of 12.3) had a death rate higher than the national death rate.

(5) The lowest per cent of mixed marriages was found in the archdiocese of Santa Fé (8.6 per cent of the marriages were mixed marriages) and in the diocese of Corpus Christi (8.9 per cent).

(6) The highest per cent of mixed marriages was found in the

diocese of Charleston (72.5 per cent), Raleigh (73.8 per cent), and Savannah-Atlanta (71.2 per cent).

This little study reveals that there is a definite need (1) to meet the growing problem of mixed marriages (mixed marriages have proved, in the past, to be one of the greatest threats to the stability of Catholicism); (2) that although the birth rate is high among Catholics, there is a significance in the different rates found in the various sections of the U. S.; and (3) that the death rate of Catholics is slightly higher than the national average.

Furthermore, the southern Catholics have the highest birth rate and the highest per cent of mixed marriages, while the northern Catholics have the lowest birth rate and the lowest rate of mixed marriages. The northern Catholic birth rate, it is suspected, is falling dangerously close to the national average. On the other hand, the southern birth rate may be expected to decline if a high rate of mixed marriages persists.

The writer would indeed consider himself fortunate if this study has proved the need for one thing: a Catholic Population Bureau to study Catholic population in the U. S. In order to save ourselves, to protect ourselves, to plan for our future, to discover our weakness and strength, we must know our birth rate, death rate, rate of mixed marriages, the age composition of our population, the geographical differences of our population, the number of women we have of childbearing age, the rural and urban Catholic birth rates, the rates of marriage, etc. How much surer we would be of ourselves and how much more accurately we could evaluate our strength and weakness if we had this information!

CLEMENT S. MIHANOVICH

St. Louis University
St. Louis, Missouri

MISSION INTENTION

"That social questions in India may be solved in accordance with Christian principles" is the Mission Intention for the month of July, 1948.

THE HOSPITAL CHAPLAIN AND THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST

The reception of the Holy Eucharist by a patient in a hospital can be either the Holy Viaticum or a communion of devotion. Many problems, both theological and liturgical, may arise in connection with the administration of the Blessed Sacrament in either of these two ways, which will offer difficulties to the chaplain, especially in a non-Catholic or public hospital. On the one hand, the sublime benefits which this sacrament confers on the soul of the worthy recipient urge the priest to be most generous in allowing the sick and the dying to receive Holy Communion; on the other hand, he must be mindful of the prescriptions which the Church in her wisdom has promulgated for the safeguarding of the reverence due to the Real Presence of Jesus Christ. It is necessary that the chaplain be sufficiently familiar with the principles of theology and of pastoral practice, so that he may be able to solve promptly at least the more common problems that will confront him in the course of his daily administrations. The purpose of this article is to discuss some of the situations that are likely to occur and to offer some decisions and suggestions which may be found practical. As was stated in a previous article, the measure and mode of ceremonial that is to be employed in the administration of Holy Communion depend to a great degree on the particular circumstances of each hospital. In some places the full rubrical requirements can be employed; in other places prudence demands the reduction of the solemnities to the very minimum.[1]

When there is question of the administration of the Holy Viaticum the principal problems are those concerned with the gravity of the illness, the physical and the mental capacity of the patient to receive the Blessed Sacrament, the minimum age, and the rite to which the person belongs. The general principles of theology and canon law pertinent to these matters are easy to find; but at times the application of these principles to individual cases provides a most perplexing problem.

The Blessed Sacrament is to be administered to the faithful when they are in danger of death, from whatsoever cause this

[1] *AER*, CXVIII, 4 (April, 1948), 256.

danger may arise.[2] This is a matter of grave precept; indeed, some theologians regard it as a divine law.[3] Corresponding to this is the grave obligation of the priest to administer the Viaticum to one who asks for this sacrament and has the necessary qualifications. The priest charged with the care of souls must be willing to endure considerable inconvenience in order that one of his flock be provided with the divine nourishment of the Holy Eucharist when there is danger of death; and the sacrament must be administered as soon as possible if there is a probability that the person may die or lose consciousness at any moment. For example, a priest has been summoned to a sickbed, and for some reason has not brought the Blessed Sacrament, but hears the patient's confession and anoints him. It is late at night and the journey back to the church to procure the Holy Eucharist would take a long time. If there is moral certainty that the sick person will survive and retain consciousness until morning, the administration of the Viaticum can be deferred until that time. But, if there is real probability that death or unconsciousness may soon befall the sick person, the priest is bound to put up with the inconvenience necessary to bring the Blessed Sacrament at once. Undoubtedly, such a case is included in the prescription of Canon Law: "The Holy Viaticum for the sick shall not be deferred too long; and those who have the care of souls shall diligently see to it that the sick be nourished with It while they are in full possession of reason." [4]

As is evident, "danger of death," as a condition for the reception of the Viaticum, by no means implies certainty that the patient will die in the present crisis. Mere probability of this occurrence is quite sufficient to justify the administration of the Holy Eucharist as Viaticum. In this connection the words of Fr. McFadden, O.S.A., intended primarily for nurses, are appropriate:

> In the nursing and medical profession the nurse will usually hear the phrase "danger of death" used as indicating that death is imminent. In contrast, Church Law refers to a person as being "in danger of death" whenever there is a reasonable expectation that death may ensue from the patient's condition, even though death is not expected in a matter

---

[2] Can. 864, § 1.

[3] Cf. Suarez, *De sacramentis,* Disp. LXIX, s. 3, n. 2.

[4] Can. 865.

of hours. Thus, even though death be not imminent, the nurse must realize that her patient is under obligation to receive Holy Viaticum.[5]

On the other hand, a very remote probability is not enough. To express it in mathematical terms, a condition which by medical testimony results in death only once in fifty times could hardly render it permissible to administer the Holy Eucharist as Viaticum, involving exemption from the obligation of the eucharistic fast. Thus, a person who is about to undergo an operation for appendicitis, when no complications are manifest, should not be given Viaticum; nor should one be granted this privilege merely because of an attack of pneumonia, though the fact that he is elderly or debilitated could render this permissible. St. Alphonsus held that a very young woman giving birth to child for the first time is in danger of death and may be given the Viaticum,[6] but in view of the progress in obstetric methods, this can hardly be held today. Needless to say, the reception of Holy Communion as an act of devotion should be recommended to all Catholics in such circumstances.

On the other hand, the priest is always justified in administering the Viaticum to any patient placed on the Danger List—the D. L.—and also to many others. Thus, if the appendix has been ruptured, or there is a diabetic condition, or a suspected cancer, the priest can regard the patient as one who can and should receive the Viaticum. Similarly, if an expectant mother is likely to have a particularly difficult delivery because of some malformation, heart trouble, etc., she can also be placed in the same class. It should be noted in this connection that at times the Viaticum may be given, even though Extreme Unction may not be administered. For this latter sacrament requires that a condition endangering the life of the patient be *hic et nunc* present in the body, whereas the Viaticum may be administered even when it is foreseen that such a condition is to be realized in the near future.

Fr. Bonzelet briefly summarizes the general condition justifying the conferring of the Viaticum and proposes some particular examples in these words: "The *periculum mortis* which exempts from the fast prescribed for Holy Communion is at hand if

[5] McFadden, *Medical Ethics for Nurses* (Philadelphia, 1946), p. 314.

[6] St. Alphonsus, *Homo apostolicus,* Tr. 15, n. 19.

there is a positive danger of death resulting from an internal or external cause, although there may be greater probability of recovery; for instance, serious operation, difficult birth, high fever, internal hemorrhages, advanced stage of consumption, slight stroke of paralysis." [7]

Whenever a person is entitled to receive the Holy Eucharist as Viaticum he is exempt from the eucharistic fast, even though he could observe the fast without any inconvenience. Moreover, as long as the danger of death continues, the Viaticum can be administered daily—indeed, as the Code states, repetition of the Viaticum is fitting.[8]

When several persons are to receive Holy Communion in the same ward, or even in different rooms of the same hospital, the priest is to recite in the plural all the prayers that are to be said before the Communion of the sick in the first room only; in the other rooms (or at the other sickbeds) he says the prayers (in the singular) *"Misereatur tui. . .Indulgentiam. . .Ecce Agnus Dei. . .* once the *Domine non sum dignus. . .Accipe frater (soror). . .*or *Corpus Domini. . .*and in the last room, or at the last bed, he says the concluding prayers and gives the blessing.[9]

The rubrics for the communion of the sick prescribe that after administering the Blessed Sacrament the priest shall wash his fingers in a vessel, and that later the water shall be poured into the sacrarium or into the fire.[10] Undoubtedly, there may be practical difficulties in the observance of this rubric in a public hospital, and if a priest conscientiously judges that it would be very difficult to observe it, I think he could use *epikeia,* and follow the older practice of washing his fingers in a spoonful of water, which is then taken by the sick person. Of course, in a Catholic hospital it would usually be easy to have a small ablution cup placed on the table at the bedside (in the last room visited by the priest when several receive Holy Communion), the contents of which are later poured into the sacrarium of the chapel.

The problem of the physical capacity of the patient to receive Holy Communion centers chiefly about the danger of vomiting.

[7] Bonzelet, *Pastoral Companion* (Chicago, 1943), p. 22.

[8] Can. 864, § 3.

[9] *AAS,* XXI (1929), 43.

[10] *Rituale Romanum,* Tit. 4, cap. 4, n. 22.

Generally speaking, if there is probable danger that the patient will not be able to retain the Blessed Sacrament, Holy Communion should not be given. However, at times a certain amount of risk is justifiable, particularly when it is feared that otherwise the sick person will die without having received the Viaticum. It is sometimes stated that the patient must have been free from vomiting for several hours before the Blessed Sacrament can safely be conferred, but it would seem that this rule can admit of exceptions, depending on the individual case. The assurance of a doctor that the patient will very likely be free from vomiting for at least a half-hour would justify the conferring of the Viaticum, though not necessarily of a communion of devotion.[11] In the case of the Viaticum, it would be allowed to experiment with a small particle of food (or an unconsecrated host, though in this event the sick person should be clearly informed that he is not receiving the Blessed Eucharist), and if there is no recurrence of vomiting for a half-hour, it would be safe to administer the Sacred Host.[12] One-half or one-third of a particle could be given. However, even when the best precautions have been taken, vomiting may occur shortly after the Blessed Sacrament is received, and in that event, if there is any indication that the sacred species remain, they should be kept in a clean vessel, available for such a contingency, so that it can be put in a safe place (such as the tabernacle of a side-altar) until all traces of the sacramental presence have disappeared. A small quantity of hydrochloric acid could be added to hasten the process of disintegration.

It is a disputed point among theologians whether the Holy Eucharist should or may be administered to one who, because of some ailment (such as cancer of the esophagus) can take food only through a tube inserted directly into the stomach. Although some particular decisions of the Holy Office seem to indicate that such an extraordinary mode of administering the Blessed Sacrament is forbidden, it seems sufficiently probable that the Holy Eucharist can be given in this manner, as long as due reverence is observed. However, there is no obligation for a person who can take nourishment only in this way to receive Holy Communion, since it is

[11] Iorio, *Theologia moralis* (Naples, 1947), III, n. 148.

[12] McFadden, *op. cit.*, p. 314.

doubtful whether the *manducatio* required for the valid reception of the Holy Eucharist is realized.[13]

The mental capacity required in the sick for the reception of the Holy Eucharist offers many problems. As is evident, one who is definitely insane, particularly if there is any manifestation of frenzy or violence, cannot be given the Blessed Sacrament. There are cases, however, when the mind is clouded and the speech rambling, yet there are sufficient grounds for believing that the reception of the Viaticum will be reverent, especially if the patient has been a devout Catholic. And, as long as he is in the state of grace and has at least the implicit intention of receiving the Viaticum (which every practical Catholic is supposed to have) the benefits of the Holy Eucharist are bestowed on him, even though he is not conscious of what is actually taking place. Nevertheless, the priest should always wait until the sacred species have been swallowed, since there may be danger that the sick person will eject the host or remove it with his finger.

It is well to note in this connection that it would not be permitted to give a person who is apparently devoid of the use of reason an unconsecrated host, to test whether or not he will consume it reverently, after the manner of experimenting with an unconsecrated host in the case of a person in danger of vomiting. For, in the case of one whose mental capacity is in doubt such a procedure is likely to induce material idolatry, since the patient may actually have enough use of reason to believe that what he is receiving is the Holy Eucharist and may render adoration to the unconsecrated bread.

Whether or not the Viaticum shall be given to a child who is in danger of death is a question that can cause the hospital chaplain grave concern. The problem is usually simple if the child is almost seven and has had a Catholic training. But the perplexing cases are that of the child of five or six, and that of the child who, though he may be professedly Catholic, has had practically no religious instruction, even though he is seven years of age or older. Yet, even in such cases the chaplain should strive to provide the little one with the requisite knowledge for the reception of the Viaticum. All that is required, as the Code states, is that the child be able to distinguish the Body of Christ from common food, and

[13] Aertnys-Damen, *Theologia moralis* (Turin, 1947), II, n. 137 bis.

to adore it reverently.[14] Notice that the Code does not demand that the child shall have attained the age of reason in the theological sense, the general characteristic of which is that there be a perception of moral good and evil. This is required in a child before he will be permitted to make his First Communion in normal circumstances.[15] But the Holy Eucharist is one of the sacraments that can be received validly and fruitfully even by one who has never attained the use of reason; and although in the Latin Church ecclesiastical law requires the attainment of this age ordinarily, this condition is waived in the case of a child in danger of death and he is permitted to receive the Viaticum before the age of reason, just as in some Oriental rites the Blessed Sacrament is given to an infant immediately after baptism. All that the Church requires for the lawful administration of Holy Communion to a Latin child in danger of death is that he be sufficiently instructed to know that what he is to receive is the Body of Our Lord and that he must receive It reverently. It should not be difficult for the priest to explain this to a Catholic child of five, endowed with average intelligence, especially if he has been taken to church occasionally and taught that God is on the altar. I do not think that such knowledge could ordinarily be imparted to a child below the age of five, yet there may be exceptions. The priest should remember that the fact that the child has not sufficient use of reason to receive the sacrament of Penance or Extreme Unction does not necessarily imply that he cannot receive the Viaticum.

A chaplain of the Latin rite requested to give the Viaticum to a Catholic of an Oriental rite should be mindful of the Church's prescription that each of the faithful, when in danger of death, is to receive the Holy Eucharist in his own rite,[16] and hence, if it is possible to procure an Oriental priest, this should be done. When this is not possible, the chaplain himself is to give the dying person Holy Communion—of course, according to the Latin rite.[17] Moreover, once an Oriental Catholic has received Viaticum according to his own rite, there is no difficulty about giving him Holy Communion (even as Viaticum) in the Latin rite subsequently in the same illness.

[14] Can. 854, § 2.
[15] Can. 854, § 1; 859, § 1.
[16] Can. 866, § 3.
[17] Can. 851.

What is the chaplain to do if a dying Oriental schismatic wishes to receive the Viaticum? According to the prescription of Canon Law, the priest may not administer the sacraments to such a person unless he first rejects his errors and is reconciled to the Church.[18] Even though the dying person is evidently in good faith and is devoutly anxious to receive the sacrament of Our Lord's Body and Blood, this privilege may not be granted him unless there is some form of retractation and acknowledgment of the Catholic Church. If the sick person is very weak and close to death, it would seem that a general statement that he wishes to belong to the true Church of Jesus Christ and to renounce any erroneous beliefs he may have held in the past would suffice to justify the administration of the sacraments that he needs in the present crisis.

It is most important for the chaplain in hospital work to be familiar with the mitigations of the eucharistic fast granted by the Church. By the general law, sick persons who have been confined to bed for a month and are without hope of speedy recovery may receive the Holy Eucharist once or twice a week, with the prudent advice of a confessor, after having taken medicine or liquid nourishment.[19] Even though the sick person can fast before Holy Communion on other days, he could still make use of this privilege, if the requisite conditions are present, twice a week. The period of a month's sickness which must have passed before non-fasting communion is allowed can be understood morally, it seems, so that twenty-six or twenty-seven days would suffice.[20] Moreover, even if a sick person were able to walk about, and perhaps even attend Mass celebrated in the hospital, he could still be allowed to partake of this dispensation if a considerable part of the day is spent in bed or in a chair.[21]

On March 25, 1946, the Holy See granted for a period of three years to all the Bishops of the United States the faculty to dispense from the eucharistic fast—so that medicine or liquid nourishment may be taken— the faithful who are sick in hospitals, for the duration of their ailment, as long as there is no scandal or surprise. This privilege was later extended to priests who are sick in their rectory or in a religious or private house. The special feature of this dispen-

[18] Can. 731, § 2.
[19] Can. 858, § 2.
[20] Iorio, *op. cit.*, III, n. 172.
[21] Cappello, *De sacramentis* (Rome, 1938), I, n. 506.

sation is that it allows non-fasting communion even from the beginning of the illness, and that every day. However, it may be used only in those places where the Ordinary has granted the dispensation.

May a woman who is in a hospital before or after the birth of a child use the privileges of the sick? There have been some theologians who regarded the process of childbearing as something natural, and consequently not an illness, unless special complications are present. However, the view that would regard a woman as *sick* even when she is going through the normal process of childbearing is sufficiently probable to justify the chaplain in allowing such women the benefits of the dispensations just explained.[22]

May a nurse, in charge of patient to whom the chaplain administers the Blessed Eucharist, receive Holy Communion on the same occasion? LaRochelle-Fink answer: "The general rule for people in good health is that they receive Holy Communion where Mass is said, and that is not usually in a sick room. If it is absolutely impossible to leave the patient, however, and the nurse therefore will be deprived of Holy Communion, it would seem reasonable for her to receive when the patient does." [23]

The hospital chaplain must be most zealous in administering the Holy Eucharist to the faithful under his care, and in promoting frequent communion. The sublime effects of the Blessed Sacrament are never more manifest than in the case of those who are suffering bodily affliction, whether or not it involves danger of death. The priest must show himself ever ready to bring the Body and Blood of Christ to those who seek this divine nourishment, even when it involves considerable sacrifice and inconvenience. The priest who acts thus can expect to receive from Our Divine Saviour a special blessing on his ministry and the power to persuade many who have strayed afar to return to the friendship of God.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.
The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

[22] *AER*, CXVIII, 2 (Feb. 1948), 145.

[23] La Rochelle-Fink, *Handbook of Medical Ethics* (Westminster, Md., 1943), p. 248.

A CENTURY OF SERVICE

The Christian Brothers in the United States, 1847-1947, by Brother Angelus Gabriel, F.S.C., a volume recently published by the Declan X. McMullen Company of New York, is intended to serve as a fitting commemoration of the arrival of the sons of St. John Baptist de la Salle in this country, and as a lasting record of their century of outstanding service to the cause of American Catholic education.

Although the first permanent foundation was made in Baltimore in 1845, the abnormal conditions following in the wake of the recent war induced the Brothers to postpone the national celebration of their centennial for three years, so that it now coincides with the hundredth anniversary of the first establishment in New York.

As early as 1819 a community of Brothers began to teach in the town of Sainte Genevieve, about fifty miles south of St. Louis, but the conditions under which they labored were so primitive that the undertaking ended in failure within a few years. Hearing of the success of the Brothers in dealing with the Canadian, French, Irish and Indian boys in Montreal since 1837, Archbishop Eccleston requested and obtained the services of three members of the Congregation who, in 1845, assumed charge of Calvert Hall in the Cathedral Parish of Baltimore. Three years later, in the fall of 1848, Fr. La Font, of the Fathers of Mercy, with the warm approval of Archbishop Hughes, arranged to bring four Brothers from France to take charge of the classes he had opened in the basement of St. Vincent de Paul's Church in lower New York. St. Louis became the scene of the Christian Brothers' apostolic labors in 1849 on the invitation of Archbishop Kenrick, and in 1859 they opened a school in Santa Fé under the patronage of Archbishop Lamy. Finally, in 1868, after an unsuccessful attempt of fifteen years, Archbishop Alemany secured a group of these religious to conduct St. Mary's College for the preparation of young men for the seminary in the California area.

Today the Institute of the Brothers of the Christian Schools numbers eighteen thousand members teaching three hundred and ninety thousand students in sixty different nations over the face of the globe. In the United States some sixteen hundred Brothers, divided into five provinces from coast to coast, care for a total of

forty-three thousand young men attending over ninety different establishments. These include five colleges, sixty-three military academies and high schools, eighteen grade schools, and seven boy-welfare institutions. In addition, the responsibility for staffing two mission units rests with the American provinces. One is located at Bluefields, Nicaragua, and the other in the Philippine Islands, the scene of the massacre of sixteen Christian Brothers at De La Salle College towards the end of the Japanese occupation in 1945.

The story of the Christian Brothers in the United States might well be summarized as a century of devoted service in the interests of the common man's son, with special predilection for the poor and the underprivileged. Their founder had been deeply moved with the wretched plight of armies of boys growing up in ignorance and vice on the streets of his native Rheims, of Paris and the other crowded centers of France, and in 1680 he inaugurated his Institute of religious teachers to afford these neglected young souls a solid Christian education. "It was to precure this advantage for children of artisans and the poor," he informs us in the *Rules* written for his disciples, "that the Christian schools were established."

•

Despite the fact that even during the lifetime of the saint some few boarding academies were established for children from families of means, the apostolate of the Christian Brothers concerned itself almost exclusively with the workingman's boy in the parochial schools of France and of many other European countries for the century and a half before their Institute was transplanted to the fertile soil of the New World. Such was the tradition of sacrifice and service inherited by the pioneer Brothers who came to teach the youth of a fast-growing Catholic America at the middle of the nineteenth century. Beginning in 1820 a flood of emigrants from Germany and Ireland greatly swelled the Catholic population of this country, over a million and a quarter Irish settlers arriving on our shores in the single decade between 1845 and 1855. This phenomenal increase in numbers presented among its many acute problems that of safeguarding the spiritual heritage of the numerous children of the newcomers. It was at this juncture that Archbishop John Hughes, the courageous and forthright protagonist of the Catholic educational system in the

United States, gave classic expression to the pressing need of the hour when he exhorted his clergy and people with these stirring words: "Let the parochial school be maintained everywhere: the day has come and the place, in which the school is more necessary than the church."

The challenge which this situation offered was met by the hierarchy and the clergy through the establishment of a chain of parochial schools in every diocese of the nation, staffed at first by bands of missionary religious recruited from the Catholic countries of Europe, and in due time by native Brothers and Sisters who soon joined the communities of their teachers. And in laying the foundation on which the magnificent superstructure of our present-day Catholic School system has been erected, the Institute of the Brothers of the Christian Schools has played an enviable role. Evaluating this contribution to the spread of the Church in America, the Fathers of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore in 1884 spoke of the Brothers' four decades of untiring service in these words: "Among the religious men who have devoted themselves with great piety and zeal to the education of youth in many localities among us, just as in Europe and in other parts of the world, those Brothers who derive their name from the Christian schools are deserving of the highest praise."

Although the normal pattern of the Institute's development in America reveals a single college and several tuition academies among the earliest foundations in each of the five provinces, the elementary school continued to be the predominant theater of the Brothers' activities almost up to the outbreak of the First World War. However, even before the turn of the present century a marked trend had set in towards greater and greater expansion of secondary and higher education, both public and private, and in the years following the armistice of 1918 the tempo of this movement has been accelerated beyond all expectation. In response to the urgent requests of bishops and pastors everywhere the Brothers by degrees relinquished to the competent hands of the Sisters the management of most of their elementary classes and transferred their energies to the field of high school teaching, the level on which we now find them predominantly occupied.

The reputation which they enjoy in our day as teachers *par excellence,* skilled specialists in the difficult art of training the

minds and moulding the characters of modern American Catholic youth, rests solidly on the foundation stones of the deep faith and enlightened zeal exhibited by the early parish school teachers. For the Brother of today as well as for his confrere of an earlier era the apostolate of the classroom is one that demands patience and self-sacrifice to an uncommon degree while waging a relentless "cold war" for Christ against the ignorance, the human weakness and the disheartening indifference to which the flesh, in the person of his immature charges, shows itself heir. In the course of the past century it is but natural that some members of the Society should have won public acclaim through their outstanding performance as writers, lecturers, scholars or administrators—Brothers Patrick, Justin, Azarias, Potamian, Chrysostom and Barnabas were well known figures in the Catholic world of their day—but the roster of a hundred years is composed overwhelmingly of the names of men who have spent themselves unsparingly and without publicity in the modest precincts of the classroom.

If men of the caliber of Cardinal Hayes, Governor Alfred E. Smith and a host of other former pupils have often gloried in the title "Brothers' Boy," it is because of the virile yet refined Christianity imparted to them in their impressionable years, and exemplified in the lives of their preceptors. Their generous young minds learned to admire the self-effacement of their teacher's vocation and to look upon him as indeed a "Brother," friend and counsellor, as one whose time and talents had been entirely consecrated to their welfare. Despite the passing of the years, the Brother remained ever young in mind and heart, moving naturally in a boy's world, maintaining a sympathetic understanding of its problems, its joys and its sorrows. He paid his students the high tribute of respect as images of the Christ-Child and as men in the making, without placing any special premium on unusual endowment of brains or of this world's goods. And in return he has won the manly affection of his students, a feeling so aptly epitomized in the appellation "Brothers' Boy," which the graduates of the Christian schools in every walk of life have eagerly claimed from New York to California.

Two dominant purposes moved the hierarchy to enlist the services of the Christian Brothers for their newly formed schools in the second half of the last century: to safeguard the faith of the immi-

grant's children, in the first place, by instructing them in the knowledge of their religion and in the love of God; and, in the second place, to provide an adequate supply of priests to meet the demands which the great increase in population made on the good offices of the clergy. How well the Brothers have fulfilled their role as catechists and have fostered priestly and religious vocations in the intervening years is a matter of enviable record.

If the disciples of St. John Baptist de la Salle are anything, they are primarily teachers of religion. Their holy founder, a priest, canon of Rheims and doctor of sacred theology, often speaks in glowing terms of the catechetical mission of his spiritual sons. At one time he assures them: "Your profession obliges you to be successors of the apostles in teaching Christ's doctrine." At another he exhorts them to "consider your employment as one of the most important and most excellent in the Church." Elsewhere he exclaims: "How greatly honored you should feel in being entrusted by the Church with an office at once so holy and so elevated, that of procuring a knowledge of religion and a Christian spirit for children." And in the *Rules* composed for the direction of his religious he refers to the instruction of children in the path of virtue and in the mysteries of religion as "the end of this Institute," and "the first and principal duty" of the Brothers.

By the Bull *In apostolicae dignitatis solio,* Jan. 26, 1725, His Holiness, Pope Benedict XIII, formally approved the Congregation and sanctioned its *Rules.* In this papal document, which has always been regarded by the Brothers as their charter and official commission from the Church to carry on the work of Christian education, it is provided: "First, that. . .they make it their chief care to teach children, especially poor children, those things that pertain to a good and Christian life, that zeal for the education of youth in accordance with the standard of Christian law should be the special characteristic, and, so to speak, the spirit of their institute."

Many years later another Sovereign Pontiff, Pope Pius X, put the stamp of approval on the catechetical mission of the Brothers when, in an audience granted the superiors on Oct. 10, 1903, he pronounced a testimonial which has become one of the greatest glories of the sons of St. La Salle: "You are the Apostles of the Catechism."

Throughout the two and a half centuries of the Society's history,

the Brothers have everywhere and always strongly identified themselves with this dominant function of their calling, consistently adhering to the policy of declining the direction of any schools in which the right to perform their prime duty, that of directing the classes in religion, could not be guaranteed.

Being a lay religious, the Brother does not participate in the public magisterium of the Church since he has not received the *missio canonica,* by which the Ordinary admits priests individually into the body of authorized teachers and confers on them the right to preach and to teach revealed truth in a public capacity. He does, however, participate in her private magisterium, and, when he possesses the necessary learning and his Institute has been admitted into the diocese by its bishop, he enjoys in common with parents, whose place he takes, the prerogative of teaching in a private capacity. Although the Brother depends on a *missio privata,* which does not require a special deputation by the bishop, as does the *missio canonica,* his status in the religion classroom is nonetheless real and definite, and his teaching vocation, authorized by papal mandate, is nonetheless significant in aiding the work of saving souls.

From the position of primacy which the imparting of religious instruction enjoys in the calling of the Brothers, it follows as a corollary that their schools have ever been flourishing nurseries of priestly vocations. Themselves renouncing all aspirations to the sacerdotal state, the religious of this Institute, the sons of families permeated with a sturdy faith and a strong Catholic atmosphere, have instinctively held the high calling of the priest in great reverence, and have played a significant part in fostering ecclesiastical vocations from the very beginning of their apostolate on the American scene.

About the middle of the nineteenth century the bishops of the United States were faced with the problem of a serious dearth of native clergy to care for the missions of a fast-expanding population. In 1854, within a decade of the arrival of the Brothers, the Archbishops of St. Louis, New Orleans, Baltimore, and New York addressed to the General Chapter of the Institute an urgent request that the Brothers in this country be permitted to include Latin in the curriculum of their schools as a means of helping to prepare suitable candidates for the seminary. Sympathetic to the plight of the hierarchy, and anxious to adapt the activities of the Society to the

conditions peculiar to the new world, the Chapter readily granted a temporary dispensation from the traditional practice and prescription of the *Rules* which forbade the teaching of the classics. For the next half century, until the revocation of the dispensation in 1900, the colleges and the academies of the Christian Brothers, along with similar institutions of other religious families, served the purpose of junior seminaries in numerous dioceses throughout the country.

Three cardinals, eleven archbishops and thirty-two bishops represent the contribution of the Christian Brothers' schools to the hierarchy of the United States, not to mention the thousands of religious and diocesan priests who have come under their influence in numerous grade schools, secondary schools, and colleges.

Beginning in 1854, for half a century the priests of the diocese attended Christian Brothers' College in St. Louis before entering the major seminary. From its first annual commencement in 1866 until the turn of the century a good part of almost every graduating class at Manhattan College, New York, was composed of young men destined for the altar. The title "College of Cardinals" applied to Manhattan is a felicitous one since two of her sons who were raised to the dignity of princes of the Church at the same consistory in 1924, Cardinal Hayes of New York and Cardinal Mundelein of Chicago, had graduated from her academic halls within a year of each other. In addition two archbishops, and three bishops, along with a host of priests, of whom over a hundred are now living, have been on the roster of Manhattan's alumni. La Salle College in Philadelphia numbers seven mitred sons, along with several hundred members of the clergy, and a like picture could be painted for the other colleges conducted by the Brothers.

The story of St. Mary's College in California is unique in that it was founded in 1868 for the express purpose of directly preparing students for the seminary. On the Sunday following the arrival of Brother Justin and his seven pioneer companions to open the new college, Archbishop Alemany triumphantly announced to his congregation: "I have made a journey of 20,000 miles to get the Brothers. I have at last succeeded. Let us give thanks to God." Nor were the prelate's sanguine expectations unfounded, for St. Mary's in a short time supplied the Church on the Coast with its

first native priests and continued for years to help spread the faith by preparing men for their seminary studies.

Innumerable priests during the past hundred years have been able to trace the first seeds of their holy calling to the religious instruction imparted to them in the grade schools by zealous Christian Brothers. The loss of the privilege of teaching Latin during the first quarter of the twentieth century, however, deprived the Society's high schools and colleges of the direct role they had previously played in fostering priestly vocations, and by the time classical studies were restored to the curriculum by direction of the Holy See in 1923, separate preparatory seminaries were flourishing everywhere. Nevertheless, the secondary schools and colleges of the Brothers continue year after year to contribute no small quota of vocations to the ranks of the clergy.

Now, if it is the sacred duty of the religious teacher to labor assiduously to assure an adequate supply of shepherds for the spiritual flock of Christ, it is likewise his right to look to the hierarchy and clergy as staunch supporters and active propagators of his own way of life. A hundred years ago the Christian schools were fulfilling a glorious destiny by helping to preserve the faith of the immigrant's son and by equipping him intellectually to make his way in a society imbued with strong prejudices against him for his religion and his race. Although in the intervening years God has signally blessed and prospered the Church in this country, the Catholic schoolroom and its religious teachers are as desperately needed now as they were in those days of hardship and struggle. Today an alarmingly crass and aggressive secularism pervades and poisons the daily life of the American people, and in recent months its champions have succeeded in banning God and any semblance of religion from the classrooms of our public schools by a decision of the Supreme Court of the land. The antidote for us against this powerful evil lies in an increase on every level of institutions of learning pervaded by the religious atmosphere which Pope Pius XI describes in his Encyclical *On the Christian Education of Youth,* and guided by competent, devoted religious teachers.

On the occasion of their centennial observance the Christian Brothers appeal to the clergy, whose auxiliaries they are in the work of saving souls, with the dual request for the charity of their prayers, and for their support in fostering vocations to the teaching

Brotherhoods. Privileged to ascend God's altar at the great Sacrifice of the New Law, the priest can there supplicate Heaven's blessings on the Institute, praying that the faith and the zeal bequeathed to it as characteristic marks by its founder, and admirably exemplified in the lives and deeds of the pioneer American Brothers, may continue to fire the minds and hearts of the sons of St. La Salle and give renewed strength and vitality to their apostolate for youth.

Perhaps no vocation in the Church today is more misunderstood than that of the teaching Brother, and surely the priest more than anyone else, through his frequent contacts with the young, holds a most advantageous position for remedying this illogical and lamentable condition. It can easily be explained to the prospective postulant that a Christian Brother is a non-clerical religious, a professional teacher whose first duty, by papal commission, is the instruction of young Catholic Americans in the knowledge and love of God. Even though the candidate must possess the same general qualities demanded of the aspirant to Holy Orders, sound health, normal intelligence and a good moral character, he proposes to adopt a state of life which by design and free choice excludes the sacred dignity of the priesthood. Consecrated to God in a special, formal manner through the vows of religion, and striving for sanctity according to the pattern of a *Rule* sanctioned by Holy Mother Church, he dedicates his time and his talents with lifelong enthusiasm to the service of young people, looking forward to the supernal reward promised by the Sacred Text when it assures us: "But they that are learned shall shine as the brightness of the firmament: and they that instruct many to justice, as stars for all eternity" (*Daniel,* 12:3).

In September of 1845 the *United States Catholic Magazine,* referring to the inauguration of the Brothers' work in America, wrote: "We look upon the establishment just opened in Baltimore as destined to form an era in the annals of education and of Christian piety in the United States. We may hope, not presumptuously, that it will become with the blessing of God, the nursery of a numerous and devoted band of men who will spread themselves far and wide over this country, to labor truly in the great cause of education, and to instruct the rising generation in that two-fold knowledge which will render them good Christians and useful citizens."

Reviewing the development of the Brothers' labors from our vantage point at the end of a century, we can readily understand how well the hopes of this early writer have been realized, for in God's Providential designs, the humble beginnings made by three religious in Baltimore have expanded into an organization of some sixteen hundred teachers exercising the duties of their calling in almost a hundred flourishing institutions. And yet, measured by the rich harvest of souls that stands ready for reaping, the number of laborers continues pitifully few. God grant that the apostolate of the Christian classroom may appeal to more and more generous and noble young souls, enabling the sons of St. La Salle to swell their ranks with good vocations and thus fulfill in ever broadening spheres their lofty destiny of service to future generations of American Catholic youth.

BROTHER ALBAN OF MARY

Manhattan College
New York, N. Y.

OUR LADY AND THE DEFENCE OF THE FAITH

No one will fail to remark how much the merits of the venerable Fathers and Doctors of the Church, who spent their lives in the defence and explanation of the Catholic faith, redound to the Virgin Mother of God. For from her, the Seat of Divine Wisdom, as they themselves gratefully tell us, a strong current of the most sublime wisdom has coursed through their writings. And they were quick to acknowledge that not by them but by her have iniquitous errors been overcome . . .

Hence it is that the Church and the Fathers have given expression to their joy in Mary in words whose beauty equals their truth: "Hail, voice of the Apostles forever eloquent, solid foundation of the faith, unshakeable prop of the Church"; "hail, thou through whom we have been enrolled as citizens of the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church"; "hail, thou fountain springing forth by God's design, whose rivers flowing over in pure and unsullied waves of orthodoxy put to flight the hosts of error"; Rejoice, because thou alone hast destroyed all the heresies in the world."

—Pope Leo XIII, in the encyclical *Adiutricem populi,* issued Sept. 5, 1895.

THE ORDEAL OF FATHER WALL

Part VI

"Bishop, Fr. Wall is a heretic."

"Come in, Father, and have a chair. Now, what is this about Fr. Wall?"

"I said, he's a heretic."

"That's a pretty serious charge, Father. You must have some very good reason for saying it, for if it is not true you could be liable, under Canon 2355, not only to pay damages for the injury to his reputation and to make up for what harm results from your words, but also to undergo penalties and penances which seem fitting, including, since you are a member of the clergy, suspension or removal from your office and parish, if the case should warrant."

Fr. Warmenhuis gulped. Stirring uneasily in his chair under the steady gaze of the Bishop, he cleared his throat and started over.

"What I meant to say, Bishop, was that I heard Fr. Wall give a sermon night before last which disturbed me. I was certain that I had run across the ideas not long before. I searched the sermon books and could not find it. Then, when I picked up Denzinger and started to read some more about the Modernist heresy I found there just the ideas which Fr. Wall had been putting out in the sermon. That is why I said that he is a heretic."

"Are you certain that you remembered exactly what he said, and that you did not allow your reading in this book to which you refer to influence your thinking, making you read into Fr. Wall's words something which was not actually there? I take it that you did not make a stenographic report of the words he actually used."

Fr. Warmenhuis admitted that he had not made such a report of the actual words which Fr. Wall had used in the course of the sermon in question. He insisted, however, that his memory had not played tricks on him and that the ideas which he now charged to Fr. Wall were actually set forth by the latter and were not just something he had read into the sermon when he later read about them in Denzinger.

"Well, assuming that the report is correct, let us see what the definition of a heretic is. Canon 1325, paragraph 2, tells us that if a person, after receiving baptism and keeping the name of Chris-

tian, pertinaciously denies some one of the truths which are to be believed with divine and Catholic faith, or doubts about it, he is a heretic. Fr. Wall, of course, is baptized and keeps the name of Christian; but are you certain that he pertinaciously denies some one of the truths which are to be believed with divine and Catholic faith, or doubts about it? That word pertinaciously calls for a certain amount of stubbornness. Can we be certain that that is true here, or may he perhaps be simply mistaken about the point on which he was preaching?"

"Well, if the Pope said the ideas were wrong when he condemned Modernism, he must have been talking about truths of divine and Catholic faith and Fr. Wall was certainly talking contrary to what the Pope said."

"Could he have been merely mistaken?"

"I wouldn't know about that, but he certainly shouldn't have been preaching that stuff from the pulpit."

"I'll grant you that the people are entitled to have the official teaching of the Church given to them from our pulpits. That is what they expect when they come to church and that, indeed, is what they come for; otherwise they would stay home or go elsewhere; but our problem right now is whether Fr. Wall is, as you have charged, a heretic, and that means one who not only believes contrary to the official teaching of the Church, but one who does so pertinaciously. Have you had a talk with Fr. Wall about the matter?"

"Why, no, I came right down here to you, for I thought that as Bishop you ought to know about it."

"Naturally, I have to know what is going on in the diocese; but what bothers me right now is that we read in Matthew, chapter eighteen, 'But if thy brother shall offend against thee, go, and rebuke him between thee and him alone. If he will not hear thee, take with thee one or two more: that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may stand. And if he will not hear them: tell the church. And if he will not hear the church, let him be to thee as the heathen and publican.'[1] Now, it seems to me that while it is, indeed, bad that there should be scandal, as it says in the preceding verses, scandal such as Fr. Wall may have given by his words, still, we must

[1] Cf. *Matt.* 18:15-17.

consider him, too, as one of the sheep which the good shepherd goes to seek if it gets lost."

"Furthermore," continued the Bishop, "we must follow the instruction of Christ with regard to this case where our brother seems to have offended against us. According to the procedure laid down in the Gospel, it would seem that you should first, on becoming aware of his offense, go to him and have a talk with him about it. Obviously, from the whole idea of the passage, which is that the good shepherd goes after the strayed sheep, leaving the ninety-nine, with the intention of bringing it back, even on his own shoulders, your talk with him should be so conceived and executed that it will bring him back to the right track, correcting his mistakes in a kindly way, so that he will be glad to avoid such errors in future sermons and will, so far as possible, correct any false impression made on the hearers of the sermon which was at fault. Certainly, until it is clear that he is not entitled to his good reputation nothing should be done to cast any shadow upon it. Remember the Inquisition always proceeded secretly, lest a man's reputation be injured only to find later that there was no ground for the accusation made against him, at which time, of course, it would be almost impossible to repair an injury to reputation."

"If you find," added the Bishop, "that he will not listen to you, the next step would be, according to the Gospel, to take with you two or three others, presumably those who are capable of persuading him, to have a talk about the matter. Only after that second attempt is unsuccessful, does the Lord say the Church is to be informed and to move officially in the matter."

"Well, all right, I'll try that; but what about the people who got a false impression from his sermon?"

"Do you know how many got a false impression?"

"Why, all those who were present in church that night."

"Were they all paying that close attention?"

"Well, maybe not all, but most of them must have been."

"Wouldn't it be a good idea, first, to find out how many of them got the wrong impression? Then, wouldn't it be a good idea to correct that impression gradually, by giving them the correct official teaching of the Church without referring directly to the wrong statements made by Fr. Wall—you see I am assuming you are correct in saying the statements were wrong—since a direct reference

would serve to imbed more deeply in their minds that which should not be there?"

"Well, maybe you're right, Bishop. I'll try it."

"You see, Father, heresy is a very bad thing, because it perverts what Christ told the Apostles to tell the world. He knew what He wanted us to know and He instructed the Apostles and ordered them to tell us, assuring them and us that He would help to keep that doctrine pure, correct. He also warned us, through them, that there would come anti-Christs, opposed to Him, who would try to lead astray, if possible, even the elect. In other words, He said that there was a message which He was sending to us which He wanted us to accept and to follow, and that we must be careful to get it straight, not perverted by those who are opposed to Him. We have to be very careful, then, of this message which we have received from the Apostles, handed down from generation to generation, and which we are in our turn obliged to hand on unchanged to the next generation. We are like men who own land along a river, able to use the water but obliged to send it on unpolluted to the next one entitled to it. We must not let anything or anyone corrupt that message. If, at times, something happens which seems to falsify in any way His words, we must take steps against it, correcting if possible, the ideas in the mind of him who makes the false statements, and, certainly, so far as possible the ideas which he has put into the minds of others."

"If I recall correctly," continued the Bishop, "what I once learned in Church History, it was always considered a black mark against an inquisitor who went out to handle a heretic if he lost the man. If he corrected the false ideas and brought peace back to the Church and the faithful, he had done his duty; but if he so acted that the one who was attached to heretical beliefs remained stubborn in them, he was not a good inquisitor. Certainly it would be wrong to do anything which would emphasize the incorrect idea which may be in the minds of the people and so imbed it more deeply there, as any good salesman could testify."

"Then you think we should let the case of Fr. Wall slide?"

"No, Father, what I think we should do is follow the instructions which Our Lord laid down in the Gospel, handling the situation in such a way as to bring back the 'lost sheep,' if he is a 'lost sheep'

and such other 'lost sheep' as may have become such by hearing what he said in the course of the sermon."

"All right, that's what I'll do," said Fr. Warmenhuis, rising to leave.

"Now, remember, you go first to talk with Fr. Wall. Find out whether it is a case of simple mistake on his part, or whether there is a bad disposition there. Then talk to him as you've never talked before, remembering that his soul and the souls of many others may depend on how well you do your job. If he listens to you, you will gain your brother, as the Gospel says. If he does not, we'll see who else can join with you, mutual friends, so that his ideas may be straightened out. Meanwhile, you and the other priests from whose parishes the people came who heard him preach that sermon should begin to explain the true doctrine. Keep me informed of your progress as you go along, so that if, finally, all efforts to talk to him come to naught we shall be in a position to move in the matter."

As Fr. Warmenhuis shut the door the Bishop looked up at the Crucifix hanging on his office wall and breathed a fervent prayer that this situation might be solved without the loss of any of the souls entrusted to his care.

* * * * *

Some days later Fr. Warmenhuis was back in the Bishop's office to report that he had had a talk with Fr. Wall. The latter had got the sermon from an old book by a Frenchman. He had not used the book in a long time and had wanted to get something out of the ordinary for his sermon at the closing of the Forty Hours Devotion. He was shocked to find that the ideas which he had been setting forth were among those condemned by Pope Pius X. Warmenhuis had taken along the copy of Denzinger, and as they discussed the matter he had shown it to Wall. The latter just could not understand how it could happen that the ideas in one of the books he had used were apparently the same as those which were set forth in Denzinger as condemned by the Pope.

"Who wrote the book?" asked the Bishop.

"Some Frenchman. His first name is Alfred. The last name is spelled something like L-o-i-s-y."

In response to the Bishop's summons, the Chancellor came in with a copy of the Index of Forbidden Books. There, under the

name, Loisy, Alfred, was the work *Le quatrième évangile,* with the notation *Decr. S. Off. 16 dec. 1903.*

"Is this the title of the book he had?"

"That's it, all right," agreed Fr. Warmenhuis.

"As you can see, it is on the Index. Do you have a copy of the Index?"

"No, Bishop, I never thought it would be of any use to me."

"Does Fr. Wall have a copy?"

"I don't think so."

"If he had had a copy and had used it he would not have got himself into this mess, do you think?"

"No. I guess it is a practical book to have around at that."

"What have you and the other priests done to clear up in the minds of the people the ideas that Fr. Wall mistakenly put there?"

"Well, he and I have agreed that we will discuss the matter at the next clergy conference, next week, and get the other Fathers to go along with some sermons which will give the straight doctrine to the people. And you can bet we won't be using any books which are on the Index. We're not going to foul things up again."

This time as Fr. Warmenhuis closed the door behind him the Bishop looked up to the Crucifix and breathed a prayer of thanks, that the situation was at least beginning to straighten itself out.

* * * * *

"Now, Fathers, we have to take up the matter of Fr. Wall," said the Bishop some time later to the two priests who sat with him in his office. They were two of the Synodal Examiners of the diocese.[2] The Chancellor was also present in his capacity as Notary of the diocese.[3] All of them took an oath in the presence of the Bishop that they would keep secret whatever they might learn about Fr. Wall in the course of the process, especially with regard to documents which were secret in nature, their discussions of the subject, the way the voting might go and the reasons advanced in the course of the voting.[4] The Bishop warned them that if they failed to observe these rules he would not only be required to remove them from their offices, but also might punish them with other proportionate penalties. They would also be liable, he added,

[2] Cf. Can. 385-90. [3] Cf. Can. 372, § 3. [4] Cf. Can. 2144, § 1.

for any damages which might follow from their breach of their oath.[5]

The Chancellor was present because in this, as in all the other cases of administrative procedure, a notary was required who would write up the report of what took place in the course of the handling of the case and after it was signed by all those participating therein, would keep the report in the archives.[6]

The procedure in this type of case was summary, of course, but that would not prevent two or three witnesses being heard, if the matter warranted it. They might be summoned either *ex officio* or at the request of the party involved, so Fr. Wall would have a chance to put on witnesses in his behalf, should he so desire when the occasion presented itself. He could not present a lengthy list merely for the purpose of delaying the solution of the case, which was to procede as speedily as might be consistent with equity and justice. It would be for the Bishop, after consultation with the Examiners or Pastors-Consultors, to decide whether the witnesses were in fact presented for a good reason, or merely to delay the process.[7]

At this meeting, then, the Bishop and the Examiners, with the notary recording their entire discussion at length, proceeded to consider the matters which the Bishop had discovered in his previous investigation of the case, together with the reports which had come in from Fr. Warmenhuis with regard to the sermons on marriage in the Jordan parish and the ideas the people had got from them, as well as his report on the teachers of catechism in the Jordan parish. They also went over the Chancellor's report with regard to the financial statements and the possibility that some income which did not appear on the statements might be found in different deposits.

The matter of the *odium populi* seemed clear to all three men. There was the matter of the old lady who had died without the Last Sacraments, which was not too well established, and there was the very definite bad feeling on account of Fr. Wall's treatment of the janitor. The Chancellor noted the unanimity of opinion thus far. They were also disturbed by the fact that the *odium* seemed to be growing, instead of diminishing, even though Faber had been

[5] Cf. Can. 2144, § 2. [6] Cf. Can. 2142. [7] Cf. Can. 2145, § 1.

re-hired by Fr. Wall. It looked to the group as if the only solution for the matter would be for Fr. Wall to leave the parish, even though that would be hard on him for he had been there a long time, and had otherwise done good work there. It was too bad that he would have to leave, but after all, it would not be too good for the parish to have feelings like these continue and grow stronger.

On the matter of financial administration, however, the two Examiners were not so convinced of any misuse of parish funds. The Bishop, himself, was not too certain that there had been any actual misuse. He was willing to concede that point. He did not like the fact that the reports from the parish had shown less than the actual amount of income, but he was not inclined to believe that there had been any actual misappropriation by Fr. Wall. The three men discussed the matter at considerable length and could not imagine on what Fr. Wall might have spent it, if he had spent the money. He had not bought anything expensive for himself. He was still driving the same old car. The Examiners had both been in his parish recently on a visit and had not noticed any expensive improvements, such, for instance, as would not have been covered by the expenditures listed on the reports which they had before them.

One of the Examiners suggested that perhaps Fr. Wall was simply putting something aside with the idea of picking up a piece of land for expansion of the parish plant sometime in the future when costs would be less. He might even have in mind the acquisition of a lot on which the parishioners could park when they came to Mass. A number of the parishes were considering the problem of parking these days. Then, too, he might have in mind the rebuilding of one or more of the present buildings. All agreed that Wall was not the type one would expect to take the money for his own personal use.

The other Examiner suggested that it might be possible, too, that he had in mind the keeping down of the apparent net income in order to avoid any increase in assessments on the parish. That had happened before, to his knowledge. In fact they had had a previous case in which such a thing had been an important factor in disposing of the man involved.

The first Examiner spoke up again, wondering whether there might not have been actually less income in the parish than the

Chancellor suspected. After all, he could not prove the exact amount of the income which the parish had had during the past years when the reports looked suspicious to him. This Examiner thought it interesting, to say the least, that the drop in revenue had occurred about the time of the first trouble with Faber. Could it not be, then, that people had simply stopped contributing because they were annoyed at Fr. Wall's manner of dealing with the janitor? The Chancellor's idea went on the assumption that no matter how much the people might have come to dislike Wall they were still contributing at the old rate or at a better one. That, thought this Examiner, was a gratuitous assumption, and Wall should not be condemned on this point without further proof.

That would be another argument on the point of *odium populi,* the Bishop observed. Did they really think that the dissatisfaction among the parishioners had gone to that length? It was true that they did not like the pastor, some of them, and that they were saying things about him which were not very loyal, but did they really think that things had come to such a pass that they were refusing to contribute to the parish just because he was still there as pastor? Were that established it would be quite clear, of course, that his useful ministry in the Jordan parish was at an end; for the parish should not have to suffer because of the continued presence of a man who was objectionable to the people.

Was there any unusual and unaccountable rise in the income of any neighboring parish or parishes around Jordan, the Examiners wanted to know. The Chancellor would have to look that up, for he had not thought to check on that point. The session was adjourned for the time being while the Chancellor left the room to get the reports of the neighboring parishes so that the board could go over them.

When he returned with the financial reports the session was resumed and the Bishop and the two Examiners bent over the statements for a considerable length of time. There did seem to be an increase of income in two of the parishes. There was no particular reason for such an increase. The parishes had not grown in the past few years, and there had been no new industries brought into them. There was room for a general increase, it was true, with more money being available; but it did not seem that there should have been quite the amount of increase which appeared

in these reports. Both of the Examiners, as well as the Bishop, were quite familiar with the territory of the parishes in question and knew what the financial status of the people was. These were parishes which could be reached quite readily from Jordan. There was a beautiful highway leading from Jordan to both of them, and, except in the winter, it would be a pleasure to drive there on Sunday mornings to Mass.

All in all, it began to look as if the matter of *odium populi* was not only present but also that it was quite serious. In fact, the increase of income in those two neighboring parishes was progressive from year to year. It seemed that as Fr. Wall's parish income went down, though the whole decrease was not explained by the increase in the other parishes, that of the others increased. It really looked as if the people were becoming so dissatisfied with him that it would be a liability to the parish to keep him there any longer.

After this lengthy discussion the group decided that the Bishop could well invite the pastor to renounce his parish within a certain time. They agreed that a month would be ample time for him to do so. The Chancellor was then instructed to draw up a letter for the Bishop to sign, asking Fr. Wall to resign from the position of pastor of the Jordan parish.[8]

The letter inviting the resignation set forth the reason which moved the Bishop to ask Fr. Wall to resign, namely *odium populi.* It also gave the ground on which it was conceived that the *odium populi* existed. Such a statement of the reason and the grounds for it was, of course, required for the act of requesting the resignation to be valid.[9]

The letter contained also a paragraph to the effect that if the pastor did not resign within the month allowed to him, or did not ask for a delay, or did not object to the reasons given for requesting the resignation within that time, and the Bishop found that he had learned of the letter inviting his resignation and that he was not in any way prevented from answering within the time required the Bishop would remove him immediately from the parish.[10]

Should it appear that Fr. Wall had not learned of the letter or that he had been prevented from answering within the time required, the Bishop would have to provide for the situation either

[8] Cf. Can. 2148, § 1. [9] Cf. Can. 2148, § 2. [10] Cf. Can. 2149, § 1.

by repeating the invitation to resign or by prolonging the time within which the pastor could answer.[11]

The session adjourned and the Chancellor went off to write the letter to Fr. Wall. The Bishop and the two Examiners discussed for a few moments more the sad turn events had taken. Fr. Wall was really a likable fellow; but one did have to consider the good of the parish. Perhaps he would accept the invitation and resign. In that case they would see about getting him assigned to some other place where he would be able to do good work, unhampered by the hard feelings which had grown in Jordan.

(To be continued)

THOMAS OWEN MARTIN

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

[11] Cf. Can. 2149, § 2.

"ON THE MANNER OF QUOTING SACRED SCRIPTURE"

First, the preacher should always so identify the sacred texts in his sermon that it will be clear to his auditors that it is Our Divine Lord who speaks, and not the preacher. If an explanation is to be given, the preacher must be careful not to give the impression that the explanation is his own invention, but should refer to the interpretation of one of the Fathers of the Church; or at least be very careful to give no explanation that is not in accord with parallel places in the Scriptures. Regarding the Gospel maxims—one should never take it upon himself to "prove" them, but should simply state them as incontestable, and then explain how they may be put into practice. For example, in order to show the necessity of humility, it must first be shown that Our Lord has commanded us to be humble, telling us that unless we become as little children, we shall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven. It would be useless, and ridiculous, to "prove" this. But it can be established how just and indispensable this commandment is; that since humility is an inescapable necessity for poor and wicked servants such as we are, we must strive without ceasing to attain it. After this, various occasions for the exercise of humility can be suggested. It is by such a method that the preacher brings out in detail what is virtually contained in a Scripture text, and illustrates its meaning in a familiar manner.

—*La véritable manière de prêcher selon l'esprit de l'évangile.* Anonymous (Paris, 1691), pp. 144 f.

"MEDIATOR DEI" AND THE LAYMAN AT MASS

The encyclical *Mediator Dei,* issued on Nov. 20, 1947, and published in Latin in the *Osservatore Romano* on Nov. 30, has but one primary objective: to relieve the tension (more in some countries than in others) that has arisen from certain disciplinary and dogmatic disputes, particularly with regard to the Mass and related matters. At a time when the Church is menaced by formidable external foes in so many countries, the absolute need for internal harmony is self-evident. It is to be hoped, therefore, that writers and speakers who now undertake the interpretation of this momentous encyclical will do so in a spirit of charity and objectivity. Any other attitude would defeat the very definite purpose of the encyclical.

To accomplish his purpose, the Holy Father does three things. First, in several passages he praises those who have worked so zealously to promote interest, understanding, and active cooperation in the liturgy. Second, he cautions these against various excesses, both disciplinary and dogmatic. Finally, he cautions others of the clergy who are so fixed in the rut of liturgical routine that they refuse even to consider the possibility of innovations. Such innovations, of course, are not to be introduced without permission of the Ordinary.

The encyclical is divided into four sections of which the second is the most important. Although this section throws light on various disciplinary and dogmatic aspects of the Mass, it devotes considerable space to clarifying the part which the laity have in its offering. That this subject needs clarification is clear to those who have been following the more recent literature about the Holy Sacrifice. Certain expressions have been used which would seem to exaggerate the layman's role in the Mass. Not a few theologians were worried about these expressions. So much so that the eminent canonist, Felix Cappello, S.J., felt constrained to insert the following note (missing in previous editions) in the latest edition of his *De sacramentis*: "Dolendum vehementer quod minus accurate de hac re nonnulli loquuntur, passim asserentes, universos fideles offerre Missae sacrificium, eosdem habendos esse tamquam ministros et munere fungi sacerdotum! In his aliisque facile error theologicus latet." We shall, therefore, limit ourselves

to an interpretation of this one part of the second section of the encyclical.

At first sight it would appear that the laity may not be said to offer the Mass at all, by reason of the following defined proposition of Trent that has been neatly summarized in Canon 802 of the Code: "Potestatem *offerendi* missae sacrificium habent *soli* sacerdotes." Since it is a revealed truth that priests *alone* are empowered to offer the Mass, is it not a contradiction to say that the faithful also offer it? However, the contradiction is only apparent since dogmatic theologians universally teach that the laity also do offer the Mass. The word "offer" is analogous. According to the definition of Trent it must have one meaning applicable to priests alone. It must take on a different, though analogous meaning, when referred to the laity. It is these diverse meanings of the word "offer" that the Holy Father unravels in this part of the encyclical.

He begins his explanation by pointing out that all the faithful should realize that it is "their very important duty and lofty dignity to take part in the Eucharistic sacrifice." Hence during Mass their minds are not to be dormant or heedless or concerned with extraneous matters, but actively united with the mind of their High Priest, Jesus Christ.

This does not mean, however, that the laity possess "priestly power" (*non idcirco sacerdotali etiam potestate fruuntur*). That the Holy Father is concerned about this matter is obvious from the fact that he reverts to it again, stating that the faithful are not mediators between God and men and, therefore, "cannot enjoy priestly rights" (*nullo modo jure sacerdotali frui posse*). Moreover, he obliges shepherds of souls to make this fact clear to their people.

Supposing, then, that this revealed truth is firmly implanted in the minds of all, we should say that the faithful also offer the Divine Victim, though in a different way from the priest. To prove this, the Holy Father gives quotations from Innocent III and St. Robert Bellarmine. He further proves the point by citations from the prayers of the Mass such as the *Orate, fratres.*

If we seek to know the source of this dignity conferred upon the laity, we find it in the baptismal character. It should be observed here that the Holy Father does not even mention the character of

Confirmation. It seems, then, that it would be a mistake to appeal to this character as a partial source of the layman's dignity to offer the Mass. In the two paragraphs referred to above, only the character of Baptism is mentioned. Nor is there any other passage attributing the layman's dignity to the character of Confirmation.

Coming then directly to the meaning of the truth that the faithful also offer the Eucharistic sacrifice, the Holy Father says that he will explain the matter "breviter presseque."

First of all, certain reasons of a *remote* nature justify the expression that the laity also offer the Mass. For example, sometimes the faithful in a body answer aloud the prayers of the priest. Sometimes also, they present their offering of bread and wine to priest that these may be changed into the Body and Blood of Christ. Finally, by their stipends the laity have the priest offer the Divine Victim for themselves and their intentions. In these three ways particularly (others are not excluded), the people may be said to offer the Mass *remotely.*

But a proximate and profound reason (*intima ratio*) also exists to explain why the faithful, especially those present at the sacrifice, are said to offer the Mass. However, to understand this reason and to preclude the emergence of a dangerous error, it is necessary to restrict the word "offer" to its precise signification.

It is plain from this section of the encyclical that the Holy Father, in accord with the almost universal teaching of theologians, places the esssence of the Mass in the consecration alone. However, for the integrity of the Mass, the priest's Communion, and only the priest's is required. Since the essence of the Mass is to be found in the consecration alone and since the "offering" pertains to the essence as its formal element, the word "offer," precisely considered, refers only to the consecration. It does not embrace the other parts of the Mass, though all of them may be said in a broad sense to be offered to God. Hence the word "offer" in its more precise signification is not a synonym for "celebrate," a word which may be applied to the entire sacrificial rite. Moreover, the word "offer" in its exact meaning does not comprise the effecting of the Real Presence by transubstantiation or the mystical immolation portrayed by the double consecration. True enough, Christ's presence and His mystical slaying are essential to the sacrifice as its *materia remota* and *proxima,* but they are excluded from the precise signifi-

cation of the word "offer." Yet again, the word "offer" in this restricted meaning does not refer to the offering of *one's self to God.* What does it mean then technically? Simply this: the directing or presentation of the Divine Victim to God the Father for the glory of the Blessed Trinity and the good of the entire Church. This presentation is the most important, the formal element of the Mass, since the presence of the Divine Victim and His symbolical destruction do not get a definite meaning until they are directed heavenward to the Blessed Trinity.

As regards the effecting of the Real Presence and the mystical slaying, these are the work of the priest alone, when he pronounces the words of consecration. In accomplishing these two effects, the priest acts in the name of Christ, not in the name of the Church. Moreover, *"by the very fact* that the priest places the Divine Victim upon the altar, he *presents* the Same as an *offering* to God the Father for the glory of the Most Holy Trinity and for the benefit of the entire Church. The offering, understood in this precise and limited sense, is shared by the faithful in their own way and for two reasons: because, namely, they offer the sacrifice not only *through* the hands of the priest, but also, in a certain fashion, *along with* him. By this participation the people's offering also is related to the liturgical worship."

The "offering" mentioned in the first sentence of the preceding quotation is the offering in the strict sense, the external offering, the only one that truly constitutes the visible sacrifice. Every sacrifice demands such an external offering, since sacrifice by its very nature is an *external* rite. Moreover, the Holy Father states that this external offering is enacted by the priest *alone* in each Mass. The priest alone has sacerdotal power, which means first and foremost that he alone can visibly *offer* the sacrificial Victim to God. However, in making this external offering, the offering in the precise sense, the priest acts not only in the name of Christ, but also in that of the faithful.

The fact that the priest liturgically offers as *minister of the faithful* is the key to the "profound reason" why the people should be said to share in the offering of the Mass. The outward liturgical offering is totally beyond their powers, but they have an intimate relationship with it and in a twofold way according to the Holy Father. First, because the faithful offer the Divine Victim *through*

the priest. Secondly and in addition, because they also offer the Victim in a certain fashion (*quodammodo*) *along with* the priest.

Concerning the first point, it is quite plain that the faithful offer *through* the priest because he bears the person of Christ the Head who offers (as the principal minister) in the name of all His members. Hence the entire Church may be rightly said to offer the Victim through Christ.

With regard to the second point, the faithful are said to offer the Victim *along with* the priest, not because they too accomplish the liturgical rite. Only the priest is empowered to do this. But since the liturgical rite by its very nature (*suapte natura*) postulates *internal* cult on the part of those who offer, the faithful may be said to offer *along with* the priest because they unite their "prayers" (*vota*) of praise, thanksgiving, impetration and expiation with the prayers and internal dispositions of the priest and of Christ Himself, the principal priest. Or, as the Holy Father puts it in another place, because the faithful should reproduce "the same *state of mind* which our divine Redeemer had when He made His Sacrifice of Himself. That is, they should bring a humble submission of mind, and they should proffer adoration, honor, praise and thanksgiving to the infinite Majesty of God." Indeed, the very external rite, though accomplished by the priest alone, *signifies* that the people also are making these internal acts of worship.

But in addition to these active internal dispositions which are so closely associated with the liturgical rite itself, the encyclical gives a second reason why the faithful may be said to offer *along with* the priest. It is because both priest and people should cultivate at Mass an *interior spirit of victimhood*. They should offer up *themselves* to God, surrender themselves to Him to do His will in all things. This spirit of self-immolation is symbolized by the Mass. Christ, the Divine Victim, substitutes for both priest and people. His mystical repetition of Calvary symbolizes the spirit of self-destruction that should animate all those whose place He takes. It should be observed, however, that this attitude of self-immolation, though it is signified very particularly by the Mass, is not restricted to the Mass alone. The same spirit should permeate the Christian at all times. It was already symbolized by Baptism. By that sacrament each Christian renounced the devil, the world and his own selfish desires. He vowed self-immolation and that

spirit should pervade his entire life. Nevertheless, this spirit is renewed in a special way by the meaning of Mass, and during it, therefore, both priest and people should again offer up themselves to God as victims.

From this summary exposition by the Holy Father two conclusions follow regarding the offering of the Mass by the laity. First, their offering is *indirect.* It is done *"through* the priest." Only he can place the outward offering which alone constitutes the sacrifice. But since he is deputed by God to be the representative of the faithful and hence places the outward offering in the name of all, the people also present the Divine Victim to God *through* him. This point should cause no difficulty. It is verified whenever an authorized agent acts for a group. Thus the people of a congressional district act *through* their elected representative in Congress. He acts *directly;* they act *indirectly.* He alone votes; but they vote *through* him. If members of the United Mine Workers wish to lodge a protest with the government, they do so through Mr. John L. Lewis. He alone protests *directly;* they protest *indirectly, through* him.

It follows secondly from the same passage of the encyclical that the faithful offer the Mass *internally only.* This does not mean that the faithful may not say aloud parts of the Mass that are of ecclesiastical institution only. They may certainly externalize these prayers if the Bishop grants permission. But such prayers, even though they may *express* an offering on the part of the people, do not constitute the Mass. The one and only offering that truly "makes" the Mass is that which takes place automatically at the consecration. When we say, therefore, that the faithful offer the Mass *internally only,* we simply mean that this outward offering at the consecration is totally beyond their power. They can only agree to it and put on the interior dispositions which it demands from them. Here again, we have a procedure that is verified whenever an authorized agent acts for a society. If a university presents an honorary degree to President Truman, the external offering is made by the president of the university *alone.* He acts in the name of the whole institution. But his external offering signifies that not only he, but also the other members of the university have internal dispositions of esteem or gratitude or good will to President Truman. So it is at Mass. The priest alone has the power externally to

offer the Divine Victim to the Blessed Trinity. But his external offering postulates internal dispositions from him and from all for whom he offers. These internal dispositions should correspond both with the purposes of the Mass and with its symbolization, which is the state of victimhood.

Such seems to be the correct interpretation of this part of the encyclical. The Holy Father has added nothing to the traditional teaching about the laity's share in the offering of the Mass, but he has put down that teaching briefly, concisely, clearly. It would seem to be his desire to eliminate for the future ambiguous expressions about the matter. It is also his desire that the faithful should be instructed regarding their noble role in the offering of the sacrifice. For it is a noble role, one that is limited to those who are endowed with the baptismal character. No longer should the faithful assist at Mass "quiescenti neglegentique animo et ad alia excurrenti atque vaganti." Much has been done to eliminate this inactive condition. Much remains to be done. The Holy Father congratulates all who have been active in this apostolate, particularly those who have been promoting interest in the liturgy.

CLARENCE MCAULIFFE, S.J.

St. Mary's College
St. Mary's, Kansas

CHARITY OF THE ENGLISH MONASTERIES

Thus the providing for the poor became one of the great duties and uses of the Church. This duty rested, before, on the land-owners. . . . This duty could be lodged in no hands so fitly as in those of the clergy; for, thus the work of charity, the feeding of the hungry, the clothing of the naked, the administering to the sick, the comforting of the widow, the fostering of the fatherless, came always in company with the performance of services to God. For the uncertain disposition of the rich, for their occasional and sometimes capricious charity, was substituted the certain, the steady, the impartial hand of a constantly resident and unmarried administrator of bodily as well as of spiritual comfort to the poor, the unfortunate and the stranger.

—William Cobbett, *A History of the Reformation* (Westminster, Md.: The Newman Bookshop), p. 48.

NEW CONCEPTS IN THEOLOGY

Any study of the history or the development of sacred theology necessarily looks towards the present and the future as well as towards the past. Basically, of course, such a study considers the elaboration of the proofs and expositions of Christian teaching in the past. It indicates the time when and the circumstances under which the various technical terms and expressions now current in theological literature first made their appearance.

Inevitably, however, a study of the history of sacred theology leads to some sort of theory about the function and the value of these technical terms and expressions in present-day literature and even, to a certain very limited extent, in the various dogmatic formulae into which they have entered over the course of years. Some have imagined that these technical terms are completely extraneous to the original deposit of Christian revelation. Others have taught that such terms represent concepts fundamentally and originally foreign to the genuine Christian message while, at the same time, they hold that these concepts have been appropriated by or assimilated into the body of Catholic doctrine as instruments useful for a time at least in expressing the truth and in confounding heresy. A third view of technical theological terminology describes it as introduced into the lexicon of Christian doctrine only because each one of these words has been found accurately and to some extent readily to set forth a meaning really contained in the message we accept with the assent of divine Catholic faith.

The notion that theological or even dogmatic developments are merely accretions to, rather than clear and accurate statements of, the doctrine God has revealed through Jesus Christ Our Lord is far too extravagant and unscientific to deserve the consideration of Catholic theologians. It would mean that when we teach, for instance, that the sacramental character is *reductive* a quality of the second species, a potency, that we would be making a statement entirely foreign to the original deposit of Christian revelation. It would mean that practically the entire content of scholastic theology is devoid of any Christian value. Finally, it would imply that, since a good number of these technical theological terms have become integrated into the various dogmatic formulae of the

Church, that these dogmatic formulae could not be considered as statements of truth revealed by God through Our Lord.

An application of this teaching to Catholic dogma constitutes one of the crasser aspects of the Modernist heresy. In the Anti-Modernist Oath we find a reprobation of the "error of those who affirm that the faith proposed by the Church can run counter to history, and that Catholic dogmas, in the sense in which they are now understood, cannot be reconciled with the truer origins of the Christian religion." [1] The statement that the technical theological phraseology which has been incorporated into the dogmatic formulae has no relation to the original deposit of divine revelation is merely the assertion of an error long since condemned by the Catholic Church.

The belief that technical theological terms, while not entirely unrelated to the original deposit of revelation, are primarily expressions of concepts assimilated into the body of Christian doctrine to serve as "contingent" instruments in proposing and defending that doctrine has attracted a certain amount of notoriety in our own day. Historians of dogma and of sacred theology have ascertained that certain technical terms and phrases have appeared in the exposition of Christian doctrine at definite times during the lifetime of the Church. Thus, for example, during the twelfth century the theologians as a group came to describe grace as a form. In this, as well as in similar instances, it is supposed that they took a distinctively Aristotelian concept, and employed this concept as a means for explaining the revealed message. According to this theory, the concepts thus introduced were "vital," and hence effective instruments for teaching at the time they were first introduced. The proponents of this viewpoint hold that these philosophical concepts remain "contingent," even after they have been integrated into the dogmatic formulae of the Church itself. Hence they believe that progress in sacred theology in our own time must involve the abandonment of those concepts which have ceased to be "vital," and the replacement of these notions by others more in line with modern thought.

This second theory is more cleverly conceived and more respectfully expressed than the one which considers all technical terminology as introducing completely extraneous elements into Christian

[1] *DB*, 2146.

doctrine. Nevertheless, it too is manifestly unacceptable. If the technical terms incorporated into sacred theology and into the various dogmatic formulae really designate ideas or concepts which serve only as "contingent" instruments for the teaching of Christian doctrine, then the propositions in which these terms are predicated of theological and dogmatic subjects are not properly true at all. If the concept expressed by the technical phrase "the sole formal cause of justification" were not objectively identical with that designated by the term "sanctifying grace," then the statement of the Council of Trent and of scholastic theology to the effect that sanctifying grace is the sole formal cause of justification would not and could not be properly true.[2]

If the concept of a formal cause were thus a merely contingent pedagogical instrument in the teaching of Christian doctrine, the term designating this concept could have no more than a metaphorical or symbolic function in the theological thesis or the dogmatic formula.[3] In such a case, the teaching of Trent would actually mean that the concept of a formal cause could serve to help men understand how sanctifying grace functions in the process of justification, or that, with reference to justification, sanctifying grace holds a position something like that which a formal cause occupies in relation to the entity it determines.

Actually, however, neither dogma nor theology contain any such teaching. Both assert that sanctifying grace *is* the only formal cause of justification. Such a statement cannot, of course, be dismissed as merely metaphorical in character, since the object used in a metaphorical proposition must necessarily be so manifestly different from the subject it serves to explain that the figurative nature of the attribution is self-evident. St. Paul spoke of the Church as the Body (σῶμα) of Christ. This metaphor is instructive

[2] Cf. Sess. VI, cap. 7. *DB*, 799.

[3] Cf. the passage of *Pascendi* in which Pope Pius X describes the teaching of the Modernist as a theologian with reference to what was called symbolism. ". . .since symbols are but symbols in regard to their objects and only instruments in regard to the believer, it is necessary, first of all, according to the teachings of the Modernists, that the believer do not lay too much stress on the formula, as formula, but avail himself of it only for the purpose of uniting himself to the absolute truth which the formula at once reveals and conceals, that is to say, endeavors to express but without ever succeeding in doing so" (*DB*, 2087).

precisely because a body (σῶμα) is a kind of thing manifestly different from a society. Thus the figure serves to show the ineffable intimacy of Our Lord's association with the company of His disciples. In the same way, the liturgy speaks of Christ as the Lion of the tribe of Juda. The diversity between a brute beast and the Incarnate Word is such as to prevent any misconception that this designation is proper rather than figurative. Thus the metaphor can serve to teach the strength and the triumphant character of Our Lord. In both of these cases the concept of one object is used as an instrument in teaching about the properties of another.

These conditions obviously cannot be verified in the case of the technical terms employed in theology and in the dogmatic formulae. There is and there can be no *prima facie* evidence of diversity between the concepts of sanctifying grace and the sole formal cause of justification. Hence a proposition which predicates one of the other can only be interpreted as meaning that these concepts are objectively identical. In the event that they are not thus objectively identical, then the proposition which predicates one of the other can never be explained as merely metaphorical. It must be rejected as false.

Those who hold that technical terms in theology stand for new concepts introduced into the fabric of Christian doctrine have blundered, not only in expounding the faith, but in explaining the facts of history. They have drawn a conclusion to which the evidence at their command gives no support whatever. The history of sacred doctrine shows many an instance of new terms being introduced. It does not and it cannot present evidence that these new terms, as used in the content of sacred theology or in the dogmatic formulae of the Catholic Church, designate concepts which are *objectively* distinct from those contained in the original deposit of divine public revelation.

Indeed, the evidence points in exactly the opposite direction. The Catholic Church is commissioned and divinely empowered to present the truths of divine public revelation to the men of all times, of all cultures, and of all places. In order to carry out that commission, the Church must obviously translate its message into the various languages and dialects of mankind, and must restate the same message from generation to generation. Thus, even in the same language, there have been necessarily new terms and new

phrases appearing very frequently in the course of history. But, given the divine commission and power of the Catholic Church, all of these newly introduced expressions have served only to set forth the one divine public revelation which Our Lord originally handed over to the Church through the apostles.

Some of the terms introduced into theology and ultimately into the Church's dogmatic formulae were previously found in the lexicon of Aristotelian philosophy. Obviously the men who first employed these expressions in the teaching of divinely revealed truth had no intention of teaching that the Aristotelian system itself was a part of the divine message. But the terms they chose had definite and recognized meanings, and the old theologians found that they could, with proper qualification, serve to express quite effectively and succinctly certain concepts inherent in the divine message. The concepts these terms manifested were already in existence and had, from the very beginning, been found in Our Lord's teaching. The technical terms gave the men of Aristotelian culture an effective means for teaching Catholic truth to the faithful of their own day.

The assertion that these new technical expressions, as they stand in the fabric of Christian doctrine, actually express ideas objectively foreign to the original content of divine public revelation carries with it the wholly unacceptable implication that the Church's teaching, at any given point in its history, is not actually and objectively the body of truth originally confided to the Church by Our Lord. Thus, in the final analysis, the interpretation which sees the concepts expressed by technical terms in dogmatic formulae merely as "contingent" instruments for the presentation of Christian doctrine involves a misunderstanding or at least a highly confused notion of the Church's own infallibility. And since sacred theology by its very nature intends to give only a clear, unequivocal, and certain statement of the Church's teaching, any idea that technical terms in this science stand for ideas objectively foreign to the original Christian message involves a serious misunderstanding about theology itself.

Progress in sacred theology, now as always, consists primarily in an adequate and accurate translation of invariable revealed truth into the vernaculars of the various men to whom the Church brings its teachings. Obviously the work of translation demands the

use of previous statements of the faith. Consequently, positive or historical theology makes a tremendously important contribution to this work in bringing forward and evaluating the sources and the older texts. Invariably a proper theological presentation of revelation for any era involves the statement, in language now understandable, of the truths which theology as such has always taught in the Catholic Church.

Hence this theological progress connotes, not the substitution of one set of "contingent" concepts for another, but a restatement in terms understood by men of the present day of those very truths which were expressed and are still expressed in the technical language of scholastic theology. Such a restatement or translation involves something far greater than the mere transfer of terms from one language into another. The Latin term *causa formalis,* for example, is not adequately translated into the American vernacular by the expression "formal cause." The Latin expression served to express a highly complex and profound notion which can only be conveyed to a modern listener or reader by a great number of words. It is ultimately important that the explanation be absolutely accurate and that the terminology employed be readily intelligible to the men of our day and our culture.

To a certain extent, of course, all theological terminology is inadequate. But we must not forget that it is inadequate as a description of the Triune God, the primary Object and the center of all theology. It is not necessarily inadequate with reference to the revealed message itself. The Church has been entrusted with a definite message, originally presented to it in human words. The terms used in later ages by the Church and its teachers should express not only accurately but adequately the content of the Church's one essential message, presenting in the words of our own day the teaching which Christ entrusted to His Church in Aramaic terms.

The growth and progress of theology consist in an ever more perfect grasp of the same truths of divine public revelation. New problems arise, but the only problems with which sacred theology is directly concerned involve questions about the meaning of the divine message itself. Theology is equipped to examine and to answer these questions, but its answers must always be expressions of the truth already contained in the divine teaching, and

now better understood because more intensively examined. The result is not and cannot be an addition of concepts objectively distinct from those previously contained in Catholic teaching, but a more perfect grasp of the old concepts and an accurate expression of these concepts in terms of our own day.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

In the July, 1898, issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* the leading article, by Fr. F. P. Siegfried, of Overbrook Seminary, is a defence of the traditional apologetic method against those who believe it inadequate for the modern mind, particularly Maurice Blondel, who upheld the method of immanence. While admitting that the "old method" should be supplemented by the findings of history, science and philosophy, Fr. Siegfried contends that it remains substantially sound. . . . The anonymous series on "American Religious Orders" continues with an article on the Sisters of Charity of Nazareth, founded in 1812 by Bishop David. . . .Another instalment of *My New Curate* is contributed by Canon Sheehan, still writing under the anonymity of "An Irish Parish Priest". . . . Fr. Joseph Bruneau, S.S., in an article on "Biblical Research," praises the recent writings of Battifol on the Gospels, particularly his treatment of the synoptic problem. . . . In the *Analecta* we find a decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, in reference to a type of tabernacle invented by a certain Fr. Barbara, who apparently wished to receive explicit approval of his invention. While praising the intentions of the inventor, the Sacred Congregation refused to give his tabernacle any special approbation, on the grounds that this matter pertains to the Ordinaries. . . . A communication in the Conference section criticizes a method in vogue in the writer's diocese, whereby a senior curate receives $600 annually, and a junior curate only $500. The writer suggests that all receive the same salary. . . .There is an account of a meeting of seminary presidents, held at St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie, N. Y., to discuss seminary education in its relation to the higher training of the clergy at the Universities. Presiding over the meeting was Msgr. Conaty, Rector of The Catholic University of America.

F. J. C.

Answers to Questions

A "PLANNED PARENTHOOD" PROBLEM

Question: Some doctors attached to the staff of a Catholic hospital have been attending public meetings in favor of "planned parenthood." Should they be admonished that they must stay away from such gatherings under penalty of dismissal from the staff? If so, who is supposed to give the admonition?

Answer: It is difficult to see how a Catholic hospital could retain on its staff a doctor who openly advocates planned parenthood—which according to present-day terminology means family limitation through contraceptive methods. It would be a source of grave scandal if a doctor favoring such a program were allowed to remain a member of the staff of a Catholic hospital. It is possible, indeed, that a doctor might attend a planned parenthood meeting on a single occasion, without realizing what such conduct would involve; and in that event, he should be given instruction and an admonition. If he promises to sever his connections with the planned parenthood movement, he could be retained at the hospital. But if he refuses to make this promise, he should be asked to resign from the hospital staff. This ruling should be applied to non-Catholic as well as to Catholic doctors. As is evident, we are speaking of the case of a doctor whose attendance would be regarded as a mark of approval. If a doctor is openly opposed to contraception, and attends meetings of planned parenthood associations merely to argue against the proponents of this movement, or to learn their tactics and arguments, he would surely give no scandal.

The answer to the question as to who should give the admonition and the ultimatum in the case of a doctor who is showing approval of the planned parenthood movement by his attendance at the meetings would depend on the particular status of the hospital. If it is owned and operated by a community of religious, the superioress or the nun in charge of the hospital would have the responsibility of performing this task. If the hospital is a diocesan institution, the priest who has been appointed as its supervisor would be the proper person to deliver the admonition.

G. K. C. AND THE TRUE RELIGION

Question: What answer should be given to a statement such as appears in *Modern Christian Revolutionaries* (p. 154) in the chapter on G. K. Chesterton: "Chesterton, by giving his allegiance to the Roman Catholic Church, fell below the level of the highest life-conception of his time and country. For that only is highest which comprehends all knowledge and all experience, however contradictory. Religion, like wit, sees the consistency in things, it is the discovery of a unity in diversity; the final reconciliation of contraries"?

Answer: It is not easy to give a reply to a person who makes such statements, because his error is so fundamental. We must first try to get him to see that truth is one. If a person does not admit that only one of two contradictory statements can be true, it is impossible to argue with him. If a man believes that various systems of religious belief, each of which is at odds with the others, are all equally good, irrespective of whether any one is true, a Catholic cannot conduct a serious discussion with him on religion. Statements such as that quoted by the questioner show how dangerous it is for Catholics to read such books as *Modern Christian Revolutionaries* when they are not sufficiently trained in philosophy and theology.

DECEPTION IN THE CAUSE OF CHARITY

Question: It seems to be fairly common to introduce into campaigns for the raising of funds—charity funds, especially—a procedure of this nature: those who are managing the campaign do not report all the receipts in the beginning, but give a low figure as the actual amount taken in so that the workers and the prospective donors are left under the impression that the campaign will not reach its goal unless the workers are more diligent and the donors more generous. Then, at the "psychological moment" the funds are reported as coming in rapidly, and a final appeal is made to reach the quota, even to surpass it. What is the morality of such a procedure? Could a Catholic in conscience participate in such a method of raising funds?

Answer: While there is no obligation on those conducting a charity campaign to announce publicly the actual intake, and it

might even be permitted to make such vague statements as that a greater amount had been expected, etc., it is difficult to justify any procedure such as is described by the questioner, which would seem to be a definite statement that only a certain amount had been received, whereas actually a much greater amount had been contributed. In the circumstances this would amount to a downright lie, and if this falsehood serves as a motive to some to contribute more than they would have contributed had they been aware of the true state of affairs, it would seem that an act of injustice has been perpetrated to the extent of the amount over and above what they would have given if they had known the truth. The principle involved is the same as that which is applicable when a beggar induces someone to give him alms by pretending to be in much greater need than he actually is.

A Catholic could not in conscience participate in the propagation of such a false statement. However, he would not necessarily have to denounce the methods of those in charge, and under certain circumstances he could participate as a worker or donor even though he knew that deceptive statements were being made.

A PROBLEM IN STERILIZATION

Question: A woman has had two children, both of whom were brought into the world by a Caesarean operation. On the second occasion the attending obstetrician declared that the woman would never be able to give birth to a child normally, and that another pregnancy would very probably prove fatal. Accordingly, he recommended that the fallopian tubes be tied up as a protection against such an occurrence. Would such a procedure be permissible? In other words, would ligature of the tubes in such circumstances be regarded as a lawful therapeutic sterilization?

Answer: The tying up of the fallopian tubes in the circumstances described would be a grave sin against the law of God, an unlawful act of sterilization. The fact that another pregnancy would probably (or even certainly) cause the woman's death does not justify the procedure by rendering it a lawful therapeutic sterilization. A lawful therapeutic sterilization takes place only when an operation or treatment is given which, though it produces sterility, also *by its very nature* confers a physical benefit suf-

ficiently great to compensate for the evil effect, sterility. Thus, the excision of the reproductive organs when they are seriously diseased is permissible, since such an operation *by its very nature* has a notable beneficial effect on the health of the patient, in addition to its sterilizing effect. In such a case we legitimately apply the principle of the double effect, so frequently used in moral theology. But in the case presented the ligature of the tubes in itself contributes nothing toward the well-being of the woman; it merely produces sterility. It is true, this is directed to a good effect inasmuch as it prevents the physical harm which would (probably or certainly) be consequent on another pregnancy. But this good effect is produced *by means of* the bad effect; hence, one who would hold that such an operation is lawful would have to admit that a good end can justify a bad means. If the woman in question wishes to avoid the dangers of another pregnancy, the only lawful method is abstinence from sexual relations, either completely or periodically.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

THE TABERNACLE VEIL AS THE SIGN OF RESERVATION

Question: Since the use of an outside tabernacle veil is of strict obligation, should it be used on all altars, that is, on the side altars as well as the main altar, since the Blessed Sacrament is reserved usually only on the high altar and the tabernacles on the side altars are empty?

Answer: The Ritual (IV, 1, 6) prescribes that the tabernacle in which the Blessed Sacrament is reserved should be enveloped in an external veil (*conopaeum*) and the Sacred Congregation of Rites has decided that even when the tabernacle is of precious material or of elaborate design, the obligation of the *conopaeum* still remains (S.R.C., Aug. 7, 1880, and July 1, 1904). The tabernacle veil should not be used around a tabernacle unless it actually houses the Blessed Sacrament. This *conopaeum* is therefore a sign of reservation, even more than the sanctuary lamp, as lamps may burn before any altar or in front of pictures and statues of the

saints. This external veil, therefore, is not to cover tabernacles on side altars except when they contain the Sacred Species. *En passant*, we might observe that it is by no means required that every altar be built with a tabernacle. This structure should be restricted to altars which are to be used for the reservation of the Blessed Sacrament, hence, to the high altar, which is the usual place of reservation, and to *one* of the side altars, at which the Blessed Sacrament will be occasionally reserved, as for the distribution of Holy Communion during the Forty Hours' Devotion, when the Blessed Sacrament is solemnly exposed on the principal altar.

THE CANDLESTICKS SHOULD BE *ON* THE ALTAR

Question: In decorating the altar for Christmas, a priest used pedestals at the side of the altar for the Mass candles, both for High Mass and Low Mass, insisting that the rubrics merely prescribed the number of candles which should be lighted for the celebration of Mass without prescribing just where the candlesticks should be placed. Is there any law which requires that these candlesticks be on the altar itself?

Answer: The rubrics of the Missal (*Rub. Gen.* XX) state very definitely that the candlesticks holding the candles to be lighted during the celebration of Mass be placed on the altar itself. The text reads: "Super Altare collocetur Crux in medio et Candelabra saltem duo cum candelis accensis hinc et inde in utroque ejus latere."

PRIMARY AND SECONDARY FEASTS

Question: What is the basis for the distinction between primary and secondary feasts? In the front of the Breviary, we find a list of the feasts divided into several classes: *duplicia I classis primaria, duplicia I. classis secundaria* (only one), *duplicia II classis primaria, duplicia II classis secundaria,* etc.

Answer: In the tables referred to by our questioner, the Breviary lists the various feasts of the calendar *ratione qualitatis.* A primary feast of our Lord or of the Blessed Virgin is one which honors some more important act or mystery of the life

of our Saviour or of His Mother and one that is not commemorated in some other feast. Thus Christmas, Easter, Ascension, and Corpus Christi are primary feasts of Our Lord. Only one *duplex I classis* among the feasts of Our Lord is listed as *secundarium,* that is the feast of the Precious Blood. The feast of the Sacred Heart was of this class until rather recently when it was officially ranked among the primary feasts. The great festivals of our Lady, the Immaculate Conception, the Annunciation, and the Assumption, are primary feasts, of the first class. The Purification, Visitation, and Nativity of the Blessed Virgin are also primary feasts but of the rank of doubles of the second class. *Duplicia II classis secundaria* are the feasts of the Seven Sorrows (that for September) and of the Holy Rosary.

Of the saints, the primary feasts are those which commemorate their *natalitia* or *quasi-natalitia,* while the secondary ones are those instituted in memory of less important events connected with them as, for example, the finding of their relics or their transfer to a new place of enshrinement, the feast of the conversion of St. Paul, of St. Peter's Chains, of the reception of the Stigmata by St. Francis, etc.

LONGEVITY OF THE "EASTER WATER"

Question: The water which is blessed on Holy Saturday, usually called "Easter Water," is to be used, as I understand, only on Holy Saturday and during Easter Week. Is it proper to go on using it indefinitely in place of the usual holy water?

Answer: The rubric of the Missal, governing the services of Holy Saturday, directs that before the sacred oils are poured into the baptismal water, the people are sprinkled with it and a certain quantity is taken out for use in blessing houses and other places. The more explicit rubric of the *Memoriale rituum* (VI, ii, 13) prescribes that the water taken from the font just before the addition of the holy oils is to be used for the holy water fonts and for the blessing of houses and food and for the sprinkling of the congregation (evidently at the *Vidi aquam*) the next day. The Ritual (VIII, 4) prescribes that for the blessing of houses, proper to Holy Saturday and also to the entire Easter season, the

holy water to be used is that taken from the font, as mentioned above. For the blessing of food, "especially during Paschaltide," the Ritual says nothing of any special holy water.

Our conclusion is that the use of the "Easter water" should be confined to the Eastertide instances just enumerated and that it is not to be considered as a substitute for the ordinary holy water during the rest of the year.

THE SAINT FELICITAS OF THE *NOBIS QUOQUE*

Question: There are two feasts of a St. Felicitas, one on March 6 and the other on November 23. Which one is regarded as that on which a bow should be made during the *Nobis quoque peccatoribus*?

Answer: The St. Felicitas of the *Nobis quoque peccatoribus* is usually considered to be the one whose feast is celebrated, along with that of St. Perpetua, on March 6. The St. Felicitas of November 23 is perhaps the more famous of the two of that name as she was the mother of seven martyr sons. The St. Felicitas whose feast is set for March, is the one of whom we read that in answer to her prayer the birth of her child was accelerated lest she be deprived of the martyr's crown because of the prohibition of exposing to torture women in pregnancy. She is associated with St. Perpetua, mentioned before her in the *Nobis quoque peccatoribus,* who was a noblewoman while Felicitas was a slave-girl. Both were martyred at Carthage in the year 203, along with three companions, Revocatus, Saturus, and Saturninus. The association of St. Felicitas with St. Perpetua, in the prayer of the Canon of the Mass, is the foundation of the more general teaching of liturgists that the St. Felicitas of March 6 is meant and not she of November 23. Some authorities, however (v. g. Wapelhorst, 116), favor the latter date. In any case, on March 6, a bow is to be made at this point in the *Nobis quoque* on account of the mention of St. Perpetua, about the date of whose feast there is no confusion.

WILLIAM J. LALLOU

Analecta

In an Apostolic Constitution, dated Nov. 30, 1947,[1] our Holy Father decreed that the matter of the sacred orders of deaconship, priesthood, and episcopate consists only in the imposition of hands and that the form of these respective sacred orders consists only of the words univocally signifying the sacramental effects of ordination. This general statement he then applied to the sacred orders in detail. He determined that in ordination to the priesthood, the essential imposition of hands is the first, made silently by the ordaining bishop, but not the continuation of this act by the elevation of the right hand. The words constituting the form, he asserted, are those taken from the Preface. In the case of deaconship they are, "Emitte in eum, quaesumus, Domine, Spiritum Sanctum, quo in opus ministerii tui fideliter exsequendi septiformis gratiae tuae munere roboretur." In the case of priesthood they are, "Da quaesumus, omnipotens Pater, in hunc famulum tuum Presbyterii dignitatem; innova in visceribus eius spiritum sanctitatis, ut acceptum a Te, Deus, secundi meriti munus obtineat censuramque morum exemplo suae conversationis insinuet." In the case of the episcopate they are, "Comple in Sacerdote tuo ministerii tui summam, et ornamentis totius glorificationis instructum coelestis unguenti rore sanctifica." Our Holy Father ordered that physical contact be made in the imposition of hands, although moral contact is sufficient for valid ordination. He indicated that the Constitution did not have retroactive effect and that doubts regarding past ordinations should be referred to the Holy See. He further commanded that the provisions of the Constitution should be incorporated in the Roman Pontifical.

By a *motu proprio* of Dec. 16, 1947,[2] our Holy Father extended the faculties of Canon 883 to journeys in airplanes. Canon 883 permits the hearing of confessions aboard ship on ocean voyages and even ashore at intervening ports if the journey is not interrupted. As a prerequisite for the enjoyment of this faculty the confessor must have received faculties either from his own local Ordinary, from the local Ordinary of the port of embarkation, or from the

[1] *Acta Apostolicae Sedis,* XL (1948), 5. [2] *Ibid.,* p. 17.

local Ordinary of any intervening port. The *motu proprio* makes no restrictions in regard to journeys by plane and there is no requirement in it that for the use of the faculty the airplane trip needs to traverse bodies of water.

The radio message of our Holy Father, sent on Ash Wednesday, 1948,[3] to the school children of the United States, is reported in the February number of the *Acta*. This was an appeal for the destitute children of the world in the same vein as that made at the beginning of Lent, 1947. Our Holy Father adverted to this former appeal and expressed his gratitude for the response given it through the prayers and alms of the American children. He insisted that the need was still urgent and expressed his confidence that the children would answer his appeal again. He closed the message with the Apostolic Blessing.

Our Holy Father's radio message delivered on the vigil of Christmas, 1947,[4] denounced the cult of the lie which has been elevated to the dignity of a system of strategy for controlling public opinion, and insisted that no lasting peace can be built by those who feel that it is a principle of elementary caution that they must distrust one another. He censured the spirit of the vendetta which has produced in the victors enormities worthy of those perpetrated by the vanquished, of a character to inspire the depiction of a scene in the Inferno of Dante. He appealed for the same degree of sacrifice for the winning of peace as was willingly made in the desire to win the war. He insisted that the timid believers are in today's struggle no better than traitors, but he assured the courageous that their number is increasing and that God will work through them to restore to the world the spirit of the Infant of Bethlehem. He prayed that as the year 1648 brought about the end of the Thirty Years' War so, three hundred years later, the year 1948 would see the rebirth of peace and the rising of the sun of justice, Christ our Lord. The message closed with the Apostolic Blessing which our Holy Father sent to all, but especially to those who had felt in greater measure the oppression of the heel of misery and sorrow.

In a radio message of Feb. 1, 1948,[5] our Holy Father expressed his gratitude to the faithful of Argentina for their generous response to the appeal which he made to them through the Cardinals

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 88. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 8. [5] *Ibid.*, p. 85.

of Buenos Aires and Rosario and for their collaboration with the efforts of the Commission for Aid to Europe. Since, however, the need had not ceased, but rather grown greater, he urgently exhorted them to continue their charitable assistance, mindful that it was Christ who was the object of their benefactions. He closed with the Apostolic Blessing.

To open the new year, the twelfth of the Pontifical Academy of Science, our Holy Father delivered an allocution on Feb. 8, 1948,[6] to the associates of the Academy in the presence of the Cardinals and the diplomatic corps, in which he showed the relation of speculative science to practical science, especially in relation to the discovery of atomic energy, the various steps leading to which he briefly enumerated. He quoted Newton, Laplace and Werner von Siemens as sustaining his affirmation of the need of humility in the face of the objective laws of nature, which men come to know little by little through experiment. In learning them they come to have in their own minds a faint replica of the archetypes in the mind of God. With the speculative knowledge thus derived, he averred, the scientist can harness these laws in the interests of practical science.

In an epistle to the Hierarchy of Poland who sent him a letter signifying their obedience on the occasion of their meeting at Czestochowa, our Holy Father, on Dec. 23, 1946,[7] acknowledged with gratitude their sentiments of loyalty. He urged them to be courageous and to welcome the trials of the hour as new occasions to repeat the triumphs which the Poles have won in the past over the enemies of the faith. He praised them for their insistence on obtaining spiritual ministrations for the imprisoned, as well as for their strenuous efforts to obtain freedom of the press for Catholics, efforts which unfortunately had not been blessed with success. He expressed his satisfaction with their labors in behalf of the destitute, especially through the Sodality called "Caritas." He asked them to look with hope to the future in which, even if the enemies of the Church will not be her friends, at least their children will be.

By two Apostolic Constitutions our Holy Father established cathedral chapters in Guaxupé, Brazil,[8] and Santa Fé, Argentina,[9] both under date of July 19, 1947. In the latter case, the canons were

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 75. [7] *Ibid.*, p. 33. [8] *Ibid.*, p. 66. [9] *Ibid.*, p. 64.

obliged to recite the Little Hours in choir and to assist at high Mass on Sundays and on other feast days specified in the constitutions of the chapter. In the case of the chapter of Guaxupé, the canons were dispensed from residence near the cathedral and from choir duty, though the bishop was given the faculty of summoning them to such duty, especially on the more solemn feasts.

Apostolic Letters dated Aug. 23, 1947,[10] established an Apostolic Internunciature in Egypt. Similar letters under dates of May 8 and May 9, 1947,[11] raised to the rank of minor basilicas the mother church of St. Victor in the City of Intra of the Diocese of Novara, and the ancient cathedral church of Treguier, now in the Diocese of Saint Brieuc.

An allocution of Jan. 8, 1948,[12] welcomed Robert Despradel, Ambassador Extraordinary of the Dominican Republic.

Decretal Letters of May 15, 1947,[13] record the steps taken in the canonization of St. Nicholas de Flüe; while Apostolic Letters of April 13, and April 27, 1947, proclaim the beatification of Blessed Contardo Ferrini[14] and Blessed Maria Goretti.[15] The further introduction of the cause of the latter with a view to her canonization was announced in a decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, Dec. 18, 1947.[16] An allocution was delivered by our Holy Father on Nov. 10, 1947,[17] to the faithful assembled in Rome for the beatification of Jeanne Delanoue; in it our Holy Father showed how the Servant of God was called to imitate our Lord's life of poverty, and the mortifications incident to it, through a vocation given her by a poor woman, who thus was the mouthpiece of the Master.

The Sacred Congregation of Seminaries and Universities under date of Jan. 20, 1947,[18] canonically established as a Pontifical University the Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro and named the Metropolitan of the Archdiocese as its Chancellor.

A decree of the Sacred Consistorial Congregation, dated May 10, 1947,[19] gave one parish from the Diocese of Arezzo and one parish from the Diocese of Pienza to the Abbot *nullius* of Monte Oliveto Maggiore.

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 72.
[11] *Ibid.*, pp. 68, 70.
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 73.
[13] *Ibid.*, p. 49.
[14] *Ibid.*, p. 18.
[15] *Ibid.*, p. 26.
[16] *Ibid.*, p. 42.
[17] *Ibid.*, p. 36.
[18] *Ibid.*, p. 43.
[19] *Ibid.*, p. 90.

A decree of the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, dated Jan. 8, 1948,[20] withdrew a small portion of the territory assigned to the Diocese of Ninghsia in China and joined it to the Archdiocese of Suiyüan; it belongs to the civil subprefecture subject to the Archdiocese.

A decree of the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, dated Dec. 18, 1947,[21] extended to all priests subject to it who have the care of souls the faculty of administering the sacrament of confirmation to those who are in danger of death, but only within the limits of their mission. For the licit use of the faculty the absence of the bishop, or his inability to act, is required. This indult was given without prejudice to other indults enjoyed by the missionaries.

Under date of Feb. 7, 1948,[22] the Sacred Consistorial Congregation reports the appointment to the Archdiocese of Los Angeles, Most Rev. J. Francis A. McIntyre, D.D., and to the Archdiocese of Omaha, Most Rev. Gerald T. Bergan, D. D.

An epistle of the Secretary of the Pontifical Biblical Commission, dated Jan. 16, 1948,[23] notes that two questions had been referred to it by our Holy Father: one concerning the period of the documents of the Pentateuch; the other concerning the literary character of the first eleven chapters of the Pentateuch. The epistle, written to His Eminence, Cardinal Suhard, avers that it is not necessary, at the moment at least, to issue new decrees in regard to matters already dealt with in previous decrees of June 23, 1905, June 27, 1906, and June 30, 1909. For the rest, the epistle counsels patience.

JEROME D. HANNAN

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 93. [21] *Ibid.*, p. 41. [22] *Ibid.*, p. 92. [23] *Ibid.*, p. 45.

WORLD PEACE

It is . . . .a fact which cannot be questioned that the true peace of Christ can only exist in the Kingdom of Christ. . . .It is no less unquestionable that, in doing all we can to bring about the re-establishment of Christ's kingdom, we will be working most effectively toward a lasting world peace.

—Pope Pius XI, in the encyclical *Ubi arcano*, Dec. 23, 1922.

Book Reviews

TRACTATUS DOGMATICUS DE EUCHARISTIA. TOME I: DE SACRAMENTO. By Emmanuel Doronzo, O.M.I. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1948. Pp. xiv + 850. $10.00.

This new volume of Fr. Emmanuel Doronzo shows the same qualities as the preceding ones: *De Sacramentis in genere, De Baptismo et Confirmatione*. The author expresses very clearly the doctrine of the Church according to the interpretation given by St. Thomas, whom he faithfully follows question by question, using the best commentators of the Angelic Doctor such as Cajetan, John of St. Thomas, Gonet, and the Salmanticenses. He combines in a suitable way positive and speculative theology, and he proposes with force and clarity the classic arguments, insisting on those points which are essential. He gives his greatest emphasis to the principles and the metaphysical analysis of the notions which they imply. We can recommend this work as well as the preceding ones.

The author treats in this book of the Eucharist as a Sacrament, leaving the treatment of the sacrifice for the following volume; but the Sacrament and the Sacrifice are considered by him according to St. Thomas as two parts of one and the same treatise. He makes extensive use of positive theology in treating the questions of the Real Presence and of Communion. His explanations clarify the main point of controversy, particularly in relation to Protestant doctrines.

Concerning the speculative viewpoint he treats extensively of Transubstantiation, examining the various opinions of theologians on the subject. He shows how the Councils of the Church first defined the conversion of the substance of the bread into the Body of Christ and then, the concept of Transubstantiation. Hence he deduces that Transubstantiation is essentially a conversive action, and that therefore a purely adductive action, combined with the annihilation of the substance of the bread is not sufficient to explain the exact meaning of the definition of the Church. The author shows very well the value of the following principle of St. Thomas: "Aliquid non potest esse alicubi ubi prius non erat, nisi vel per loci mutationem, vel per alterius conversionem in ipsum" (III,q. 75. a.2). He treats likewise in full conformity with St. Thomas the Eucharistic accidents and the manner of presence of the Body of Christ: "Per modum substantiae, quae est tota in toto et tota in qualibet parte," just as the substance of the bread was present under its own accidents. In sixty very instructive pages, he shows that the Eucharist is necessary for salvation "necessitate medii in voto implicito," in the sense that baptismal grace, received in the baptism of water or desire,

tends to the Eucharistic grace, "gratia cibans," as to the normal perfection of Christian life, as the body of an infant tends to become that of an adult.

We can strongly recommend this treatise on account of its primordial quality of full penetration of the principles by which the aforesaid questions are informed and clarified. We trust that the following treatises on the Sacrifice of the Mass and the Sacrament of Penance will have the same qualities of erudition and penetration, which are very efficient in molding the mind of theological students.

REGINALD GARRIGOU-LAGRANGE, O.P.

CANONICAL PROCEDURE IN MATRIMONIAL CASES. Vol. I: FORMAL JUDICIAL PROCEDURE. By Rev. William J. Doheny, C.S.C., J.U.D. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1948. Pp. 1 + 1277. $14.00.

This second, enlarged, edition of Dr. Doheny's work on Canonical Procedure in Matrimonial Cases is provided with a preface by His Eminence Dennis Cardinal Dougherty. The table of contents has been much expanded; though it retains the same general headings, several subdivisions have been marked off under each. This should facilitate finding particular points when they are desired in a hurry. In the earlier edition the search for such points was not so convenient as it will be now. Furthermore, several points which were subdivisions have been made into chapters; though others have been left subdivisions, as they were before. The elevation of the subdivisions to the rank of chapters does not, however, guarantee to the reader that they contain much more matter than before. The advantage is primarily one of clarity and ease in finding the points sought.

Part I of the volume, on the Instruction itself, has been enlarged from 390 pages to 575 pages. Part II, on the Application of Procedural Law in Practical Cases, has been enlarged from 290 pages to 522 pages. Three appendices, one an allocution by Pope Pius XII given in 1944 on the unique purpose of adjudications in matrimonial processes; another, important replies of the Sacred Congregations and of the Pontifical Commission for the Interpretation of the Code of Canon Law in matters dealing with procedure in matrimonial cases, with the Latin and English text on facing pages; the last, the faculties and jurisdiction of Military Vicars and of Chaplains of the Armed Forces, have been added. There is also a reproduction of the Letter of the Most Reverend Apostolic Delegate regarding marriages with Jews or Mohammedans.

A bilingual edition of the Instruction, title by title, with Latin and

English on facing pages, such as is found in the author's *Practical Manual for Marriage Cases,* is placed at the beginning of the discussion of each title. The Latin text of the articles which appeared in the first edition followed by an English translation below it remains the same in this edition. The text itself reads much the same as it did in the first edition, though some long paragraphs have been divided and some wording has been changed. The footnotes give references to works appearing since the first edition, and some show omissions of points mentioned previously.

Aside from a printing error "is to employed" for "is to be employed" (p. 577) and occasional places, such as p. 1040, where the type is not easily legible, the work is on the whole well printed.

It seems to this reviewer that there is some slight change of opinion as to the matter of domicile and quasi-domicile of a wife lawfully separated (pp. 31 f.) ; as to the matter of change of domicile in the course of the trial in 1990 cases (p. 34) ; as to presumptions in cases of judicial mandate of a procurator or attorney (p. 163). The "Impediment of Age," as it was called in the first edition is now referred to as the "Impediment of Non-age." The author likewise seems more cautious in his opinion as to the effect of legal relationship (p. 730).

Additions have been made in several places. Thus, the position of a non-Catholic plaintiff in a diocesan tribunal according to the decision of the Holy Office in 1939 appears on p. 38. The ruling of the same Holy Office that Apostates and Atheists are to be treated like non-Catholics as plaintiffs (1940) appears on p. 40. The matter of the *Officialis* as a judge of second instance in summary cases appears on p. 59. The position of the *Promotor Justitiae* with regard to the impediment of crime appears on pp. 111 ff. Denuntiation by a non-Catholic to the *Promotor* and reference to the rule of the Holy Office appears on pp. 115 f. The estoppel of Non-Catholics, Apostates, and Atheists, on pp. 116 f., is a reworking of the paragraph on "The *Promotor Justitiae* and Cases of Non-Catholics" of the first edition on the basis of the decrees of the Holy Office in 1939 and 1940.

The part on the consort as plaintiff is also reworked in view of the response of the Code Commission in 1942 and in 1946 (pp. 118-36) Prohibitory clauses regarding re-marriage are discussed on p. 140. Two new cases of presumption of validity of the marriage after death appear on pp. 148 ff. The problem of the *Promotor* withdrawing an accusation is treated on pp. 164 f. The allocution of Pope Pius XII on attorneys and drafting of the *libellus* is given on pp. 190 f.

The response of the Code Commission (1940) regarding the competency of the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments in cases of nullity of marriage appears on pp. 212 ff. P. 233, note 33, gives the letter

of the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments on the duty of the *Defensor Vinculi* (1937).

The problem of summons to one who is insane or feeble-minded is discussed on the basis of the response of the Code Commission (1943) on p. 248. On p. 336 appears Rule 70, of the *Regulae Servandae* of the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments (1923), with regard to the interrogation of witnesses. The special ruling of the Holy Office (1942) on the physical examination of the woman is referred to on p. 394.

A reminder on the nature of affidavits appears on pp. 406 f. There is also a remark on civil divorce proceedings on p. 411. In the section on cases of doubt in practice, the author adds a summary of other opinions (pp. 420 ff.). There is also a further elucidation of "incidental questions," on p. 455. On p. 480 there are some pertinent remarks on the secrecy of the judges' deliberations.

The response of the Code Commission (1943) with regard to the communication of the sentence where the parties are insane or feeble-minded appears on pp. 490 ff. The Instruction to the Apostolic Delegate for *Ratum non consummatum* cases during the war, revoked in 1947, is given on pp. 494 f. The special precautions to be observed in regard to the physical examination in *Ratum non consummatum* cases, with translation, is given on pp. 496 ff. This is the instruction from the Holy Office in 1942.

The case of two unbaptized persons who have had their case adjudged is considered on p. 513. The replies of 1942 and 1946 with regard to nullity appear on pp. 514 f. The faculties which were granted to the Apostolic Delegate during the war with regard to a tribunal of third instance, are reproduced on pp. 535 f.

The allocution of Pope Pius XII on the matter of appeal with regard to the *Defensor* of second instance appears on pp. 540 f. Abatement and Renunciation of Proceedings appears on pp. 543 f. A note to Art. 231, containing the replies of the Code Commission (1943), appears on p. 554, note 6. There is likewise, on p. 589, a comment on lack of legitimation where nonage existed.

A new case on impotence is given on pp. 611 ff., and more are to be found in the synoptic list on pp. 619-24. There is a brief remark (p. 630) on the special problems of servicemen's or former servicemen's cases, but to this reviewer it does not seem to offer much practical help.

There is a case of *ligamen* and feigned illness on the part of a Mexican contractant reported on pp. 631 ff. The necessity of moral certainty as to the fufillment of the prenuptial guarantees in regard to Disparity of Worship is taken up on pp. 651 ff. The sincerity of these prenuptial guarantees is discussed on pp. 652 ff. The following two pages take up the distinction between sincerity and conditional consent. The special

problems in cases involving the guarantees are discussed on pp. 654 f. That the prenuptial guarantees comprise only future progeny is mentioned on pp. 656 f. The Catholic doctrine on prenuptial guarantees is set forth on pp. 657 ff. The restricted nature of the dispensation from Disparity of Worship is noted on pp. 661 f. The special faculties in the cases of Hebrews and Mohammedans are discussed on pp. 662-67. The lack of legitimation of a child is mentioned on pp. 667 f. The applicability of Disparity of Worship to "ab Acatholicis nati" is discussed on p. 668.

Two new cases on Abduction are reported on pp. 673 ff. The elements of the impediment of crime according to the jurisprudence of the Rota are set forth on pp. 697 ff. The right of the *Promotor Justitiae* to impugn the marriage for the impediment of crime is discussed on pp. 685 ff.

A case on Affinity under the Code, together with a list of others is given on pp. 703 ff. Rota cases on the impediment of Public Propriety are reported on p. 723, note 61. There is also a discussion of dispensation from a diriment impediment on pp. 733 ff.

Cases on dispensations falsely requested, on obreption, on verification of the canonical reason which was not expressly mentioned are reported on pp. 741-54. A reply of the Code Commission on dispensations also appears on the last-indicated page.

Six cases on ignorance of matrimonial obligations are reported (pp. 767 ff.), and two on marriage when drunk (pp. 772 ff.), as well as two more on marriage when a party was under the influence of morphine (pp. 774-82).

A list of psychoses which the judge may find useful is given on pp. 788 ff. On pp. 802-13 appear five cases on mental disorders in which the decision was *Constat de nullitate*. These are followed by eight others (pp. 821 ff.) in which the decision was *Non constat*. Further remarks on presumptions in regard to insanity appear on p. 827, note 1, and 829, note 15. There are other cases added to the old list on insanity (pp. 830 f.).

Error of citizenship is not an "error of quality" in regard to marriage contracts, as appears from p. 845. There are six cases given on error of law (pp. 853 f.). There are thirty-seven, of which thirty-six are brief digests, cases on simulated consent reported on pp. 866-86. The list of cases which followed the reports in the old edition has also been extended here.

An expanded list of cases on Force and Fear appears on pp. 918-42. There are also digests of thirty-eight cases on conditional consent *contra bonum prolis* (pp. 961-69); twenty-seven on intention *contra bonum prolis* (pp. 971-77), followed by a list of eight more. There are